THE TRANSFORMATION OF AGRICULTURAL STRUCTURES THROUGH GOVERNMENT POLICIES IN EDİRNE PROVINCE BETWEEN 1939 AND 1960

OKAN CEYLAN

BOĞAZİÇİ UNIVERSITY

2015

THE TRANSFORMATION OF AGRICULTURAL STRUCTURES THROUGH GOVERNMENT POLICIES IN EDİRNE PROVINCE BETWEEN 1939 AND 1960

Thesis submitted to the

Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

by

Okan Ceylan

Boğaziçi University

2015

"The Transformation of Agricultural Structures through Government Policies in Edirne Province between 1939 and 1948" a thesis prepared by Okan Ceylan in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Arts degree from the Ataturk Institute for Modern Turkish History at Boğaziçi University.

This Thesis has been approved by

Prof. Dr. M. Asım Karaömerlioğlu
(Thesis Advisor) _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Meltem Toksöz _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Seda Altuğ _____

June 2015

An abstract of the thesis of Okan Ceylan, for the degree of Master of Arts from Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History to be taken in June 2015

Title: Transformation of Agricultural Structures through Govenment Policies in Edirne Province between 1939 and 1960

This thesis aims to deal with the period from the Second World War to the beginning of the 1960s, and analyze the transformation of agricultural structures in Edirne, a border province, which was situated near a battle fields and was an agricultural province due to its large size of fertile and irrigable lands. Similarly, this study analyses the agricultural transformations with the Second World War and the Marshall Plan that supervened. The thesis takes into consideration of the historical conditions of the time, international developments, and the domestic policy of Turkey and the geographical position of Edirne province. Edirne province has borders with both Greece and Bulgaria was influenced by the foreign policy of Turkish Republic. This influenced the socio-economic life of Edirne province. In this sense, the agricultural transformation of Edirne provinces and its socio-economic life indicates to what extent the government policies were influential in the agricultural sector.

This thesis aims to explain the influence of historical conditions, agricultural politics and social life; and it emphasizes geographic features, the relations of production, and more importantly the roles of peasants in crop preferences and active participation in production process. Due to its proximity to Istanbul and Europe, the flat land structure, the Thracian People's demands for economic development government policies were influential. Edirne was a border province that experienced much more economic poverty than the average of Turkey during Second World War. Besides, Edirne was agricultural province which entered into a process of economic development with the commodification of agricultural structures and market oriented production and the Marshall Plan.

As for the state, just as this thesis study aims to explain the transformation of agriculture in Edirne and its social influence, it highlights the agricultural transformation of Edirne province which reflected the developmental process of Turkish agriculture by taking into consideration of statistical comparisons with the average of Turkey.

Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Atatürk İlkeleri ve İnkılap Tarihi Enstitüsü'nde Yüksek Lisans derecesi için Okan Ceylan tarafından Haziran 2015'te teslim edilen tezin özeti

Başlık: 1939 ve 1960 Yılları Arasında Edirne Vilayeti'ndeki Tarımsal Yapıların Devlet Politikaları Aracılığıyla Dönüşümü

Dönemsel olarak İkinci Dünya Savaşı yıllarından 1960 tarihine dek ele aldığımız bu tez, savaş alanına en yakın noktada bulunan ve sulanabilen bereketli topraklarının genişliği dolayısıyla bir tarım şehri olan Edirne İlindeki tarımsal yapıların, özellikle İkinci Dünya Savaşı yılları ve sonrasında gelen Marshal Planıyla ne gibi dönüşümler geçirdiğini incelemektedir. Yaşanan bu gelişmeler dönemin tarihi koşulları, uluslarası gelişmeleri, Türkiye iç siyaseti ve Edirne İlinin coğrafi konumu göz önünde bulundurularak incelenmiştir. Yunanistan ve Bulgaristan'a sınır olan Edirne, Türkiye Cumhuriyeti' nin dış politikasından da açık bir şekilde etkilenmiş ve bu da sosyo-ekonomik hayata yansımıştır. Bu bağlamda, Edirne İlinin yaşadığı tarımsal dönüşüm ve soyo-ekonomik yaşam, bizlere bu dönemde devlet politikalarının tarım sektöründe ne dereceye kadar etkili olduğunu da göstermektedir.

Bu tez çalışması bir yandan dönemin tarihi koşullarının tarım politikaları ve sosyal yaşam üzerindeki etkilerini açıklarken, diğer bir yandan da bölgenin coğrafi özellikleri, üretim ilişkileri ve daha da önemlisi üretim süreçlerine aktif katılımlarıyla ve ürün tercihleriyle de tarım sektöründeki iş gücünün tarımsal dönüşümdeki rollerini vurgulamaktadır. İstanbul ve Avrupa'ya yakınlığı ve Trakya insanının iktisadi kalkınma arzusu dolayısıyla, devletin tarım politikalarının Edirne vilayetinde kayda değer biçimde etkili olduğu görülür. İkinci Dünya Savaşı yıllarında, neredeyse Türkiye ortalamasının üzerinde bir iktisadi sıkıntı yaşayan serhat ilimiz Edirne, Marshal Planı, tarımsal yapıların metalaşması ve pazara yönelik üretimle birlikte çok hızlı bir iktisadi kalkınma sürecine girmiş bir tarım şehrimizdir.

Özetle bu tez çalışması, bir yandan Edirne tarımının dönüşümünü ve bunun sosyal yaşama etkilerini anlatırken, Türkiye ortalamalarıyla yapılan karşılatırmalarla da Edirne ilindeki tarımsal dönüşümün Türkiye Tarımının gelişim sürecini çok net bir şekilde yansıttığını vurguluyor.

AKNOWLEDGEMENT

This thesis study is a result of a long process in which lots of people contributed to it indirectly. Firstly, I am deeply indebted to the Atatürk Institute which supported me academically and morally. I am grateful to my thesis advisor, M. Asım Karaömerlioğlu. He insipired and guided with me in studying this thesis study. I would like to express my sincere thanks to Çağlar Keyder and Şevket Pamuk. In addition to my thesis advisor, I would like to express my sincere thanks to other members of my master thesis jury: Seda Altuğ and Meltem Toksöz for contributing arguments and views.

Since I wrote my thesis study in English, many times I need extra support of my professors. In this sense, especially I must emphasize the contributions of my dear professors: Tracy Lord and Kathryn Kranzler. They helped me so much in this process. Firstly, I would like to express my sincere thanks to Kathryn Kranzler, who edited my thesis devotedly and spare extra time for its editing. Secondly, I would like to express my sincere thanks to Tracy Lord for her supporting ideas and making grammatical correction.

I would like to thank the people who helped me in many ways and made my work easier in this process. First of all, I would like to thank Alpay Balkan, Zafer Toprak and Huricihan İslamoğlu who shared their knowledge and their thoughts during my thesis study. Also I would like to thank the officials of Aptullah Kuran Library who helped me in reaching to many secondary sources. The administrative stuff of the Atatürk Institute Kadriye Tamtekin, Dilek Arda and Leyla Kılıç made my works easier during my study. I would like to thank the personels of Edirne Public Library Berna Erkan, Suat Pencik, İlkay Asar and Kubilay Asan. I would like to thank the personnels of The Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Edirne, Edirne Municipality and Edirne Agricultural Directorates.

Finally, there are two special people: My father and my mother, who encouraged and supported me to read and write all the time. I owe them much more than I can express here. Especially, due to their occupation, they shared invaluable informations about agriculture that provide me with distinct perspectives in my thesis. Also, I would like to thank the people of Rahmanca and Akçadam Villages for their narratives about the 1940s and the 1950s which I have listened since my childhood.

CONTENTS

CHAPTERS

I. INTRODUCTION..... 1

II. THE TRANSFORMATION OF AGRICULTURAL STRUCTURE THROUGH GOVERNMENT POLICIES IN TURKEY BETWEEN 1920 AND1960.....18

General Overview to the Agricultural Transformation through Government Policies in the 1920s.....20

State Investments in Agriculture in the 1930s…… …….……..…..34

The Agricultural Policy of Government during the 1940s.....41

The Agricultural Policy of Turkish Governments between 1948 and 1960.....54

III. THE WAR ECONOMY AND THE ROLES OF GOVERNMENT POLICIES IN TRANSFORMATİON OF THE AGICULTURAL STRUCTURES OF EDİRNE PROVINCE BETWEEN 1939 AND 1948.....69

Agricultural Structures in Edirne Province between 1939 and 1948.....71

The Agricultural Policies of Government 95

IV. IN THE CONTEXT OF POST WAR ECONOMIC POLICIES, THE TRANSFORMATION OF AGRICULTURE IN EDİRNE PROVINCE.....121

The Influence of International Developments on Turkish Economic Policy.....121

Agricultural Structures in Edirne Province between 1948 and 1960.....127

Government Investment in the Agriculture of Edirne Province.....146

V. CONCLUSION.....179

VI. APPENDIXES.....188

VII. BIBLIOGRAPHY.....195

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Edirne was firstly founded by Thracians and has been the home to important civilizations. Respectively, Macedonians, the Roman Empire and the Ottoman Empire controlled the fertile lands of Edirne until the first quarter of the 20th century. Situated in the junction point between Balkans and Anatolia, Edirne has always had geostrategic importance. The large lowlands and plains of Edirne are suitable for agriculture, transportation, trade and military training. Therefore, it was the capital city of Ottoman State between1361 and 1453. While it was mostly regarded as military zone by previous civilizations, its socio-economic, architectural and political development occurred in the Ottoman period such as the building of palaces, mosques, bridges and caravansaries and so on.

With regard to administrative structure, during the Tanzimat Reform Era Edirne became Eyalet (province) in 1846. The province of Edirne was constituted of Vize, Kırkkilise, Gelibolu and Filibe *sancaks* (county) in 1846. Its administrative borders were expanded until 1897. Thus Gümilcine, Dedeağaç, Tekfurdağ, Kırkkilise, Gelibolu and Filibe were the counties of Edirne in 1897.[1] In the same way, as Özey writes, with regard to provincial borders, Edirne was one of the biggest

[1] Okan Yaşar, "Edirne İlinin Nüfus Hareketleri Bakımından İncelenmesi ve Son Dönemde Göçlere Katılanların Sosyo-ekonomik Nitelikleri," *Doğu Coğrafya Dergisi* 14, no. 21 (January 2009), pp. 195-220.

provinces in Rumelia bordered by Thessaloniki in the west, Black sea in the northeast, the Sea of Marmara and Aegean in the south towards the end of the 19th century.[2] In 1897 Edirne had 64,356 km^2,[3] this decreased to 42,500 km^2 in 1912-13. Today the square measure of Edirne province was 6074 km^2 [4]

Migration and border changes that stemmed from international conflicts in the Balkans played important roles in changing both the size of the population and its ethnic and religious structure in Edirne. The population of Edirne was 777,676 in 1889, with mixed ethnic and religious composition. For example, there were 377,000 Muslims, 225,000 Greek, 104,000 Bulgarians and 15,000 Jewish[5] In order to indicate rapid increase in the local population of Edirne, Okan Yaşar states that the population of Edirne reached 986,446 in 1897. Similarly, Yaşar writes that around 80,000 immigrants were settled in Edirne between 1877 and 1891, and also almost 30 percent of population of Edirne was non Muslim in 1897.[6]

As it is signified in the guide book of Edirne Chamber of Commerce and Industry, due to lose of two important counties such as Dedeağaç and Gümülcine in the Balkan Wars to Bulgaria, the population of Edirne decreased 627,500 in 1914 and it was constituted more homogenously by Muslim population. [7] In addition, Edirne had Gelibolu, Kırkkilise and Tekfurdağ counties in 1914.[8] Some lands of

[2] Ramazan Özey"19. Asırda Edirne Vilayeti Coğrafyası,"*Marmara Coğrafya Dergisi*, no. 6 (July2002), pp. 2-34.

[3]Yaşar, "Edirne İlinin Nüfus Hareketleri Bakımından İncelenmesi," p. 198.

[4] Ibid., p. 197.

[5]Ramazan Özey, "19. Asırda Edirne Vilayeti," p. 9.

[6]Yaşar, p. 198.

[7] Republic of Turkey, *Edirne Ticaret ve Sanayi Odası Rehberi, Yüzüncü Yıl Anısına (1885-1985)* (İstanbul: Araştırma Basımevi,1985), p. 20.

[8] Yaşar, p. 198.

Edirne were lost to Greece and Bulgaria in the 20th century. Therefore, the losses of Ottoman territory can be seen as a disintegration of Edirne.[9]

Population in the agricultural sector was one of the most important means of production in extensive agricultural methods. However, due to wars, migrations, epidemic diseases and poverty; the labor force in agricultural sector decreased especially after 1878. For example, due to the large size of swamplands around the Maritsa River, malaria was common disease in Enez and Dedeağaç. With its geographical position, climate conditions and large fertile land; Edirne was suitable for cultivation, the range of agricultural production and also commercial activities. [10]

When the agricultural production in Edirne is analyzed, it is seen that Kırklareli and Tekfurdağ were famous for their viticulture and Gümilcine was famous for its tobacco at the beginning of the 1900s. In addition, Edirne state or province was famous for the orchards and horticulture. More specifically, Dedeağaç had high agricultural production capacity. For example in the 19th century, 100,000 tons of wheat, almost 6000 tons of barley, nearly 3000 tons of rye, 400 tons of corn, 40 tons of sesame, 21 tons of bean, 42 tons of chickpea, 10 tons of cotton, 1 ton of silk and 280 tons of olive were being produced annually.[11] Since silkworm breeding was important economic activity, there were many mulberry gardens in Edirne. Due to livestock breeding in large meadows; Edirne was famous for dairy products. There were around 2,500,000 goat and sheep in Edirne.[12]

Due to its geostrategic position and its population density, Edirne was also commercial town. For example, the Uzuncaova and İslimye *panayırs* (fairs) were

[9] Özey, p. 5.

[10] Ibid., p. 5.

[11] Ibid., p. 28.

[12] Ibid., p. 9.

quite famous for agricultural products, food of animal origins, rose water, carpet and bee wax.[13] Thanks to the Ports of Gelibolu, Tekfurdağ, Dedeağaç and railways (after the 1870s) that connected İstanbul to Selanik and other European cities, there were commercial activities in the19th century. Furthermore, İstanbul had met its food needs from the Edirne region for centuries.[14] In addition to maritime transport, merchants transported cereals with 20,000 camels from Tekfurdağ to İskeçe in the 19th century. There was international trade in these ports and railways, Özey mentions that 2256 ships came into Tekfurdağ port and these ships had around 206,000 tonnages annually in the19th century. By the same token, 1300 ships were coming to Dedeağaç port and they had nearly 256,000 tonnages annually. After Ottoman ships, the number of Greek ships was ranked at the second in the19th century.[15]

From the 1877-1878 Ottoman-Russian war to 1923 foundation of Turkish Republic, Edirne was exposed to Russian invasions in 1878, the Balkan Wars in 1912-13, the First World War between 1914, and 1918 and the Turkish National Independence War between 1920 and 1922. This social and political turmoil was accompanied by serious population movements, massacres, and the loss of some territory. Throughout its history, Edirne became one of the first beaten tracks in the process of migrations from the Balkans. Therefore, Muslim groups such as Turks, Pomaks, Bosnian and Cherkes settled in Edirne province. This migration influx of Muslim from the Balkans continued until the 1990s. Similarly the local Greeks and Bulgarians migrated from Edirne. Furthermore, 15,000 Jewish citizens left Thrace in

[13] Yaşar, p. 197.

[14] Özey, p. 35.

[15] Ibid., pp. 15- 16.

1934 Events. To some extent, the compulsory Jewish migration was closely related to increasing Hitler's threat in Europe and maintaining border security in Thrace. In general, these population exchanges were related to making a room for new Muslim immigrants from Balkans and creating Muslim Turkish bourgeois in Thrace.

Today, Edirne is a border province with two countries at the same time. The 204 km borders with Greece which are determined by the Maritsa River except Karaağaç. Besides, by virtue of the Lausanne Peace Treaty in 1923, the border between Turkey and Greece was determined and Karaağaç district was given to Turkey as war indemnity. Secondly, by virtue of the İstanbul Treaty of 1913, the border between Turkey and Bulgaria was determined. Edirne has almost 88 km land border with Bulgaria.

Edirne functions as a bridge between Anatolia and the Balkans. This brought about not only population movements from the Balkans and narrowing in political borders between 1878 and 1923, but also the loss of important commercial hinterlands of Edirne Province.[16] Thus, after 1923, in the development of the commercial activities of Edirne, notably İstanbul and other eastern Thracian cities such as Kırklareli, Tekirdağ and Çanakkale became important. These provinces were also connected to the Thrace Public Inspectorships that were situated in Edirne administratively. Public Inspectorships were a sort of regional governors connected to the presidency of the Turkish Republic between 1927 and 1952. By considering the changes in administrative borders and population movement from the last quarter of the 19th century to the first quarter of the 20th century, Edirne region is dealt with from social, geographical and political perspectives briefly.

[16]Republic of Turkey, *Edirne Ticaret ve Sanayi Odası Rehberi,* p. 20.

From 1927 to 1940, the population of Edirne province increased from 150,889[17] to 251,373.[18] Similar to the average of Turkey 75 percent of its population was living in rural areas, in 267 villages and townships. By the same token, most of these people were engaged in farming and animal husbandry. In addition to the birth rate, immigration from the Balkans increased the population of Edirne during the 1930s. For example, 60,000 out of the total population were immigrant in the 1930s.[19]

While the size of cultivated lands was around 940,000 dönüm out of 4,000,000 arable lands[20] during the 1920s,[21] the size of cultivated lands increased to 1,700,000 dönüm in 1939.[22] While there were around 17,000 peasant families during the 1920s and each peasant family had around 55 dönüm of land[23] the number of peasant families increased to around 24,000 peasant families in 1939.[24] On the average, each peasant family had 70 dönüm cultivated lands.[25] On the other hand, the size of cultivated lands per each family in Edirne province was around 30 dönüm larger than the average of Turkey during the 1920s.[26] Most of these lands were being cultivated by draught animals such as oxen, cattle, and horses. Similarly, while there was almost one pair of draught animals in every peasant family in 1927,[27] their

[17] Republic of Turkey, *Edirne İl Yıllığı* (Edirne: Edirne Valiliği, 2005), p. 47.

[18] Republic of Turkey, *General Census (1940)* (Ankara: Prime Ministry, 1940) p. 208.

[19] Yaşar, p. 204.

[20] Republic of Turkey, *Trakya Umumi Müfettişlik Bölgesinde yapılan Toprak Anketi (1939)* (Ankara: Prime Ministry, 1939), p. 11

[21] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Census (1927)* (Ankara: Prime Ministry, 1970), p. 7.

[22] Republic of Turkey, *Trakya Umumi Müfettişlik Bölgesinde yapılan Toprak Anketi (1939),* p. 11

[23] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Census (1927),* p. 13.

[24] Republic of Turkey, *Trakya Umumi Müfettişlik Bölgesinde yapılan Toprak Anketi (1939),* p. 11

[25] Ibid., p. 11.

[26] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Census (1927),* p. 13.

[27] Ibid., p. 14.

number increased to two pairs in Edirne in 1939.[28] In the cultivation of lands, on the average, there were nearly 70 tractors, 19,000 ploughs, 70 reaping machines, 40 lawn mowers in 1936.[29]

Similar to the average of Turkey, 85 percent of cultivated lands were cereal in Edirne province in the 1930s.[30] Wheat, barley, rye, corn and rice were prominent crops. In contrast to the average of Turkey, due to continental climate and intensive livestock farming in Thrace, the cultivation area of rye was close to that of barley. Secondly, 2 percent of cultivated land was legume.[31] Bitter vetch, bean and chickpea were prominent legumes. Nearly 13 percent of the cultivated land was industrial crops. Cotton and tobacco had largest cultivation areas in Turkey, as the sesame and sugar beet had the largest cultivation area in Edirne.[32] On the average, total agricultural production was around 150,000 tons in Edirne province during the 1930s[33] In addition to being of high nutritional value food, irrigation; the Alpullu Sugar Plant, transportation facilities and the price of agricultural products were influential in the preference of agricultural products.

Silkworm breeding, livestock breeding and apiculture were widespread in Edirne. Since Edirne had large grazing areas, livestock was pretty developed. The fertilizer of animals was used to increase agricultural productivity. With the increase of agricultural education in courses, the limited use of technology, the production of more qualified seeds in state farms and the railway transportation; increase in the

[28]Republic of Turkey, *Trakya Umumi Müfettişlik Bölgesinde yapılan Toprak Anketi (1939),* p.11

[29] Ibid., p. 94.

[30] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Census (1927),* pp. 26-34.

[31] Republic of Turkey, *Trakya Umumi Müfettişlik Bölgesinde yapılan Toprak Anketi (1939),* p. 11

[32]Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Census (1927),* p. 78.

[33] Republic of Turkey, *Trakya Umumi Müfettişlik Bölgesinde yapılan Toprak Anketi (1939),* p. 96

agricultural production and the integration of domestic market were tried to be provided during the 1930s.[34]

All in all these ideas indicate the political, economic and social transformation of Edirne province from the mid of the 19th century to 1939. Thanks to statistical data, we could have information about population, cultivated lands, and the range of agricultural products, livestock breeding and commercial activities. Also, to indicate historical continuities or ruptures, the agricultural development of Edirne province and also the influence of international developments on the socio-economic life in Edirne province; summarizing the historical process in the beginning of the 20th century had importance.

Master thesis mainly observes how the commodification process of agriculture, market oriented production and the story of Green Revolution developed in conjunction with Marshall Plan in 1948 in Edirne province which had been situated in the most closest region to battle field and had experienced more serious war economy than the average of Turkey during the Second World War. Besides, this academic study aims to explain how all these process reflect to socio-economic life of Edirne province.

As research questions, firstly we mainly aims to explain to what extent government policies played a key role in the transformation of agricultural structures between 1939 and 1960 in Edirne province. By agricultural structures, I mean labor force in agricultural sector, the size of cultivable lands, agricultural productions and the means of production in agriculture. In the same way, by government policies, we mean taxations, credit facilities, agricultural courses, infrastructural investments,

[34]Republic of Turkey, *Poultry Husbandry, Beekeeping, Silkworm Breeding Statistics (1935-1943)* (Ankara: Prime Ministry, 1945), p. 21.

associations, and marketing facilities. Secondly, this thesis tries to reveal the similarities and differences between the transformation of agricultural structures in Edirne provinces and the averages of Turkey. In other words, we question that in what aspects the story of agricultural transformation in Edirne province showed similarity to that of Turkey and in what aspects it was different from that of Turkey? Thereupon, we wonder whether or not the agricultural transformation and socio-economic developments in Edirne province between 1939 and 1960 can be regarded as laboratory to understand the agricultural transformation and socio-economic development across Turkey?

Why do we prefer to do research on Edirne province? Why do we prefer to observe the period between 1939 and 1960? Firstly, Edirne has large, irrigable and fertile lands. Thanks to its topography and geographical position, Edirne is easily accessible province. Since Edirne was a border province, the socio-economic life of Edirne gave information not only about the economic policies of Turkish governments but also about the diplomatic relations of Turkey with Greece and Bulgaria. In other words, in addition to domestic economic policies, we can easily see the reflections of international relations. Secondly, the reason why we prefer the period between 1939 and 1960 was to reveal a key socio-economic transformation. Furthermore, as far as we understand, generally this twenty years of period imprinted on the memories as a period of shortage for the 1940s and copiousness for the 1950s in Edirne province.

In order to clarify the argument and to observe it in a more detail, we mainly focus on the socio-economic history of one local region in a specific period of time. Thus, this thesis study can be regarded as economic history of Edirne between 1939 and 1960. While we are explaining the economic history of Edirne, especially we

consider the influence of geography, international relations and the economic policies of Turkish Governments. More importantly, in addition to government policies, we put the roles of peasants and the growing conditions of agricultural products in the centre. Also we regard the topographical features, the geographical structures and the material life of Edirne. In this sense, I benefited from the thoughts of the Annals Schools of History which is represented notably by Ferdinand Braduel, March Bloch, and Lucien Febvre. Moreover, in order to evaluate the subject more analytically, to avoid oversimplifications and to reveal the agricultural transformation of Edirne more clearly, the statistical data of Edirne is compared to the averages of Turkey such as population growth rate, size of cultivated lands, agricultural inputs, and agricultural outputs.

All of the chapters in this thesis dealt with the transformation of agricultural structures through government policies. In the first chapter, it is explained how domestic or international policies had influenced the development of Turkish agriculture between 1920 and 1960. The prominent government policies in the agricultural sector every ten years and their concrete results are emphasized at the national level. Similarly, in order to indicate the academic views and the thoughts of prominent researchers, especially the general historiography of Turkish economic history is explained. In this sense, different academic perspectives are revealed about the same subjects. For our thesis, this chapter provides a background.

Chapter Two examines war threat and its influence on the socio-economic life and agricultural sector in Edirne province. Since statist economic policies were implemented between 1939 and 1948, the chapter is periodized by regarding economic policies rather than government reshuffle. Furthermore, emphasis is given to the severity of war economy. Thanks to the economic statistics of 1939 and 1948,

the economic fluctuations can be understood. No doubt, the geographical position of Edirne and its proximity to battle field were increasing the traumatic and destructive influence of war economy. For example, the population of Edirne province decreased 20 percent,[35] the average size of cultivated lands decreased from 1,700,000 dönüm to 800,000 dönüm and the agricultural production decreased from 210,000 tons to 100,000 tons between 1939 and 1945.[36] In terms of agricultural production and cultivation area, 1946 and 1948 can be a first step to reconstruction. However, agricultural production could only reach to the level of 1939 in this time. In the same way, the scarcity of labor force, the decrease in agricultural production and the tax policies of RPP government are emphasized. On the one hand government encountered passive resistance of peasants in the course of tax collection. On the other hand, government tried to encourage agricultural production to meet the food needs of cities and military in Edirne. Namely there was binary state. The roles of peasants and the influence of the growing conditions of agricultural products and geographical structures are highlighted on war economy clearly.

Chapter Three addresses how Marshall Plan and the liberal economic policies play an important role in the swift economic reconstruction and economic development of Edirne province. Furthermore, it is a discussed how and why the story of Green Revolution realises swiftly in Edirne between 1948 and 1960. In this sense, increasing labour force, increasing agricultural inputs and the severe socio-economic experience of people in the 1940s are indicated as the reasons of economic development. For example, population increased by 20 percent,[37] the size of

[35]Republic of Turkey, *Edirne İl Yıllığı,* p. 47.

[36] Republic of Turkey, *Field Crops Statistics (1940-1945)* (Ankara: Prime Ministry,1947), pp. 2-59.

[37]Republic of Turkey, *General Population Census (1950)* (Ankara: Prime Ministry, 1951), p. 14.

cultivated lands increased from 800,000 to 2,900,000 dönüm[38] and also average agricultural production increased from 100,000 tons to around 580,000 tons.[39] Similar to Chapter Two, the close relations between economic policies and the roles of peasants in agricultural sector are stated. A clear-cut and a key socio-economic transformation is highlighted in the 1950s. The economic problems and the re-enactment of National Protection Law are discussed in the second half of the 1950s in Edirne province.

Although this thesis is more descriptive research, it fills a big gap in its area. It aims to contribute to the local and economic history of Edirne. In contrast to other research on Edirne, this thesis observes the agricultural transformation and its influence on socio-economic life in Edirne in a specific period of time and in a content integrity. Similarly, my master thesis tries to discuss a historical process in the analytical level. I compare the statistical data of Edirne to that of Turkey. This broadens my viewpoint and prevents my thesis from going round in circles. In this sense, I regard international relations, domestic economic conditions and geography. Furthermore, in contrast to many academic studies on Edirne, this thesis regards population as a labour force. Also it examines the close relations between the growing conditions of agricultural products and socio-economic life. Furthermore, this thesis study will provide other researchers with more analytical perspectives.

There have been some academic studies about Edirne province so far. Some of these have been about the fields of geography and also social and political history of Edirne. Similarly, there are the annuals of the Edirne Governor in 2005, and the

[38] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1959-1961)* (Ankara: Prime Ministry, 1963), p. 39.

[39] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1959-1961),* p. 39.

Guide book of the Edirne Chamber of Commerce and Industry that aim to introduce Edirne province briefly. In the field of geography, Yaşar who observes the population movement of Edirne explains almost centenary that begins from the nineteenth century to the present. Yaşar mainly specifies the influence of international developments on the population movements of Edirne province and also how Edirne turned into an emigrant province in 1975.[40] Similarly, Kocamemi deals with the political reasons for the migrations from the Balkans to Turkey. He focuses on social and political events in migration processes.[41] However, in general, these academic studies can explain only the population of Edirne. However, these academic studies analyzed long periods of time. Therefore, these academic sources are far from explaining the reasons for the population movement and discussing their socio-economic aspects. Moreover, these academic studies are far from regarding population as labor force.

Özey explains the relations between the socio-economic life and the narrowing administrative borders of Edirne province in the 19thcentury. This article gives a good idea about agriculture, livestock breeding and trade of Edirne province in the 19th century.[42] However, since this academic study analyses throughout the 19thcentury, much of the information is superficial. Similarly, labour force in agriculture, the growing conditions of crops and the mode of production are not dealt with in detail. Also the evaluation of general economic atmosphere and the integration of Ottoman economy to world capitalism are not mentioned.

Similarly, the Guide Book of the Edirne Chamber of Industry and Commerce, and the Annuals of the Edirne Governor in 2005 present a brief history and

[40] Yaşar, pp. 195-220.

[41] Fazıl Bülent Kocamemi, *Urumeli'nin Gözyaşları* (İstanbul: İskenderiye Yayınları, 2012) , pp. 1-248.

[42] Özey, pp. 1-36.

geography of Edirne province from the end of the 1800s to the end of the 1900s.[43] Furthermore, without going into detail, they give information with regard to the population, education, history, geography and culture.[44] Finally, Gökçe, Ender, and Kazancıgil explain social life and health conditions of Edirne which has experienced wars, migrations, and economic poverty since 1361[45]

Writing the socio-economic history of Edirne over one or more centuries leads to superficial explanations. These articles give information about Edirne but, no detailed information. Rather than explaining analytically, most of these sources have given general information and prominent statistical data of Edirne province. On the other hand, as it is mentioned before, we mainly focus on the twenty years of time period and the economic history of Edirne province. To be more analytical and present our findings more concretely, the statistical data of Edirne province are compared to the averages of Turkey. Thus to analyze, to what degree the agricultural developments in Edirne province comply with the historiography of economic history of Turkey between 1939 and 1960.

In the writing process of this thesis study, I have made use of lots of primary and secondary sources such as books, articles, thesis, local newspapers, and the recordings of Turkish Grand National Assembly and the statistical data of the Turkish Statistical Institute. Firstly, thanks to newspaper, I could enter into the spirit of time and have knowledge what the intellectuals and journalists of Edirne had thought about socio-economic problems of Edirne province. Then, I have made use of local newspapers that had been published between 1939 and 1960. These

[43] Republic of Turkey, *Edirne Ticaret ve Sanayi Odası*, pp. 1-221

[44] Republic of Turkey, *Edirne İl Yıllığı*, pp. 1-504

[45] Ratip Kazancıgil, *Edirne'nin Sağlık ve Sosyal Yardım Tarihi (1361-2008)* (Edirne:Trakya Üniversitesi Rektörlüğü Yayınları, 2009) pp. 1-464

newspapers are *Edirne Postası, Vatandaş, Yeni Edirne, İpsala Gazetesi and Hizmet Gazetesi.* Similarly, *Edirne Postası, Vatandaş and Yeni Edirne* were published in the central district of Edirne. On the other hand *Hizmet Gazetesi* was published in *Keşan* and *İpsala Gazetesi* was published in İpsala Town. Thanks to these newspapers, socio-economic, political and cultural life in Edirne province can be revealed between 1939 and 1960. I benefited from the archives of Edirne Public Library to observe these local newspapers. Since, only *Edirne Postası* had been published continually throughout these years, we mostly benefit from it. However, 1948 onwards, there were four newspaper more in Edirne Province.

Secondly, thanks to the recordings of Grand National Assembly, I could learn how government perceived the socio-economic developments in Edirne and what the main ideas of Edirne deputies were. From 1908 to contemporary time, all parliamentary speeches are available on the website of Turkish Grand National Assembly.

Thirdly, thanks to Statistical Data of Turkish Statistical Institutions, I could reach more concrete and numerical results about the agricultural structures and their transformations in Edirne province. Also these present tangible data to prove our arguments. All these statistical data are available on the website of Turkish Statistical Institutions. I wrote some stories of local peasants which I have heard since my childhood. Although these stories are not the bases of our study, they are included to make the general socio-economic life of the people in Edirne province. Otherwise, due to time lag and extent of the thesis study, I could not include an oral history study as a research method.

First of all, although there are many secondary sources from which I quoted references, especially I will explain briefly the most prominent ones that provided a

framework in my thesis study. First, *İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yıllarında Devlet, Tarımsal Yapılar ve Dönüşüm* written by Pamuk enabled me to understand the influence of the war economy on the agricultural sector. This article argues that in war economy, government tried to meet the food needs of the urban areas and the army therefore this policy brought about tax legislation of Governments such as National Protection Law in 1940 and the Soil Product Tax in 1943. Government aimed to buy and collect cereal crops within the Soil Product Office. However, the determined price was low. Due to labor shortages, the confiscation of draught animals, and extensive agricultural methods, agricultural production was low. Therefore, profiteering and a black market appeared during the war period. The economic policies led RPP break up political relationship with the peasants.[46]

Second, writing about the 1950s, State and Class in Turkey and also the article Türk Tarımında Küçük Meta Üretiminin Yerleşmesi written by Keyder explains the changing class balances in the post war period. As a result of war economy and new world order, the interests and world view of the bourgeois and bureaucracy started to change. The political and economic demands of the peasants played important roles in the determination of the government in the 1950s. Keyder explains the relations between migrations to cities and agricultural mechanizations. Keyder also describes the economic policies and social life in the second half of the 1950s[47] Thanks to market oriented production and the profit motive, the commodification of cultivable lands and agricultural products occurred. The construction of highways, land distribution and the use of agricultural inputs such as

[46] Şevket Pamuk, "İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılların da Devlet Tarımsal Yapılar ve Dönüşüm" in *Türkiye'de Tarımsal Yapılar (1923-2000),* eds. Şevket Pamuk and Zafer Toprak (Ankara: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2008), pp. 91-108.

[47] Çağlar Keyder, *Türkiye de Devlet ve Sınıflar* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2005), pp. 1-300

pesticides, agricultural mechanization, petroleum and chemical manure contributed to the social, legal and economic borders of private ownership.[48]

Third, *The Agricultural Development of Turkey,* written by Aresvik, also explained the integration of Turkish agriculture to world markets within the scope of the Marshall Plan. In order to increase agricultural production and the export of these products, government made an investment in infrastructure service, the use of agricultural inputs and the capitalist mode of production.[49] Similarly, *The Economic Advance of Turkey 1938-1960,* written by Singer describes the roles of Democrat Party, which understand the international course of events and had information very well about the socio-economic demands of the Turkish peasants and implemented the Marshall Plan.[50]

Finally, *Cumhuriyet Döneminin İktisadi Tarihi,* written by Tezel, specifies the economic developments of Turkey. This book gives place to statistical data about the number of peasant families, land distribution and agricultural crops across Turkey markedly. More importantly, Tezel emphasizes regional difference in the development of agriculture. Tezel underlines the importance of geography, climate conditions, the size of cultivated lands and the ranges of agricultural products, the means of production, transportation, marketing facilities, and so on in agricultural sector.[51]

---

[48] Çağlar Keyder, Tarımda Küçük Meta üretiminin yerleşmesi, in *Türkiye'de Tarımsal Yapılar (1923-2000*), eds. Şevket Pamuk and Zafer Toprak (Ankara: Yurt Yayınları, 2008), pp. 163-173

[49] Oddvar Aresvik, *The Agricultural Development of Turkey* (Newyork: American Economic Association**,** 1975) pp. 1-220

[50] Morris Singer, *Economic Development in the Context of Short Term Public Policies (1938-1960)* (Ankara: Turkish Economic Societies Publication, 1977), pp. 7-9.

[51] Yahya S. Tezel, *Cumhuriyet Döneminin İktisadi Tarihi (1923-1950)* (Ankara:Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1982) , pp. 314-375.

CHAPTER TWO

THE TRANSFORMATION OF AGRICULTURAL STRUCTURES THROUGH GOVERNMENT POLICIES IN TURKEY 1920-1960

The agricultural sector in Turkey underwent great transformation from extensive or traditional agricultural methods in which human labor, drought animals and few pesticides were used to intensive agricultural methods in which more mechanization, more pesticides and fertilizers were used. In this time period, from the point of employment, almost 80 percent of population was living in rural areas. Farming was main living source and agriculture constituted half of Turkish GDP. Thus in this economic situation, agriculture became fundamental area of interest for economic policies between the 1920s and the 1960s.[52]

This chapter discusses the transformations of agricultural structures through government policies in Turkey at the national level. By stating "agricultural structures" I mean the amount of cultivable land, employment in the agricultural sector, the variety, means of production, and the production of agricultural crops. By stating "government policies," I mean agricultural investments, credit facilities, taxations, agricultural associations, and land distribution policy, the encouragement

[52] İlhan Tekeli and Selim İlkin, "Devletçilik Dönemi Tarım Politikaları, in *Türkiye'de Tarımsal Yapılar (1923-2000),* eds. Zafer Toprak and Şevket Pamuk (Ankara: Tarih Vakfi Yurt Yayınları, 2008), p. 37.

of mechanization and also marketing facilities throughout these years. Since agriculture constituted the lion's share in the Turkish economy, it became more of an issue in terms of understanding how the process of this great transformation in agriculture took place and more comprehensively how it contributed to the socio-economic development of the country.

In addition to the domestic reasons such as wars, migration, land distribution policy, and tax policy, it is important to point out under what international conditions these agricultural transformations were realized by the government, such as the Great Depression, Second World War, and the political rapprochement between the US and Turkey in 1945. In the following paragraphs, based upon the secondary sources, a brief story of changing government policies in Turkish agriculture every decade from the 1920s to 1960 will be presented. Also the prominent points and arguments in the historiography about agricultural developments in economic history of Turkey will be indicated in these years.

After the Great Depression, Turkey began conducting statist policies so as to prevent economic crises. 1948 makes the new period in Turkish agriculture, with the beginning of the Marshall Plan[53]. Thus more liberal economic policies were conducted in the 1950s. As for 1960, it is related to the fall of the Democrat Party government as a result of military coup. Then more planned economic policies were introduced. So it opens a new era in the agricultural policies of government.

This chapter is separated into four parts. The first part covers the more liberal economic policy of the1920s. In the 1920s, population in the agricultural sector, land issue, and property ownership as a part of 1924 Constitution are discussed. The second part covers the period from the Great Depression to the end of the1940s. In

[53]Tekeli and İlkin, "Devletçilik Dönemi Tarım Politikaları," p. 37.

this time period, state-funded agricultural progress in terms of educational, technological and economic aspects, government interventionism aimed at shaping the agricultural methods of farmers and the encouragement of agricultural yields were seen. The third part deals with the socio-economic conditions of the war period and tax policy of government as another type of socio-economic interventionism between 1939 and 1948. The fourth part covers the liberal economic policies between1948 and 1960. In this time period, green revolution, the commodification of agricultural lands and market oriented production are evaluated within the scope of pro-globalization period and the political relations between Turkey and the US.

General Overview to the Agricultural Transformation Through Government Policy in the 1920s

Although the main field of study is limited to the period between 1939 and 1960, I briefly do a research on the transformation of agricultural structures through government policies in the 1920s and the 1930s. Since this state funded transformation of agricultural structures show continuity in political, legal and institutional areas, the period between 1920 and 1939 might be regarded as background for thesis.

The Influences of Migrations, Wars and Health Services on the Labour force in Agricultural Sector

One of the most important factors in agricultural structures was the size of employee. Through population data, more concrete predictions can be made about the number of population who were employed in agricultural production processes

and the share of the agricultural sector in the economy. Furthermore, since agricultural production mostly depended upon human labor in the 1920s, the number of farmers gains more importance. However, due to inadequate health services, wars and migrations, fluctuations in population were seen frequently.

The population census data, gives idea about the population of Turkey. After long years of war, the population of Turkey was 13 million in1927. In1960, the population reached 28 million. Similarly, with the end of the ten year war period and the return of many soldiers from the battle fields, the population began to increase after 1923. Furthermore, childbirth in early republican period was encouraged by state. [54] However, in addition to birth rate and death rate, there were other criteria that influence population in early Republican era.

Similarly, since almost 80 percent of the population lived in rural areas, the health policy of government in rural areas became important in increasing the life of the quality of citizens. Due to poverty, food scarcity and malnourishment many children were exposed to diseases. Thus a high rate of child death was seen. Regarding health policy of the government in early Republican era, enough medical personnel and a sufficient number of medical institutions, and health services tried to be spread in every corner of the country under the leadership of minister of health Refik Saydam.[55] Thus Government was able to prevent the malaria, typhus and

[54] İsmet Koç, Mehmet Ali Eryurt, Şebnem Beşe Canbolat "Türkiye'de Nüfus ve Nüfus Politikaları Öngörüler,"*Amme İdaresi Dergisi* 46, no. 4 (December 2013), pp. 129-156

[55] Umut Karabulut, "Cumhuriyetin İlk Yıllarında Sağlık Hizmetlerine Toplu Bir Bakış: Dr. Refik Saydam'ın Sağlık Bakanlığı ve Hizmetleri (1925-1937) "*Çağdaş Türkiye Tarihi Araştırmaları Dergisi* 6, no.15 (Autumn 2007), p. 152.

typhoid[56]. Similarly, the number of personnel who was employed in the health sector increased three times in ten years.[57]

Regarding the population in the agricultural sector, Toprak writes that from 1912 to 1938, Anatolia and Thrace experienced great changes in population structure as a result of the long period of catastrophic war that brought about the deaths of millions of people, changes in borders, and population movements especially from the Balkans to Anatolia in the early Republican era.[58]Many academic sources regarding agriculture and migration process in early Republican period state that this immigrant population was mostly employed in agricultural sector and settled in rural areas. Regarding the exchange of migrants in early Republican era, only between 1878 to 1912 years almost 1,500,000 Muslim Turks population migrated from Balkans to Turkey. Similarly when half million population migrated from Greece to Turkey with the population exchange in accordance with the Lausanne Treaty in 1923 is considered, the influence of population could be understand more clearly in the transformation of the agricultural structures. [59]

War also influenced the employment in agriculture. While the War for Turkish National Independence was waged, socio-economic life continued despite all the poverty and disease. The rate of agriculture in Gross Domestic Products was 48 percent and 6 million people were engaged in farming in the 1920s.[60] However, this number was not enough for production. Similar to Pamuk and Toprak, Eşiyok makes

[56] Erdem Aydın,"Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin Kuruluş Yıllarında Sağlık Hizmetleri" *Ankara Eczacılık Fakültesi Dergisi* 3, no. 31 (2002), p. 189.

[57]Karabulut, "Cumhuriyetin İlk Yıllarında Sağlık Hizmetlerine Toplu Bir Bakış," p.153

[58] Zafer Toprak, Türkiye Tarımı ve Yapısal Gelişmeler, in *Türkiye'de Tarımsal Yapılar (1923-2008)*, eds. Şevket Pamuk and Zafer Toprak (Ankara: Yurt Yayınları, 2008), p. 32

[59] Yusuf Sarınay, "Cumhuriyet Döneminde Ankara'ya Yapılan Göçler (1923-1990)"*Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Dergisi,* 27 (2011), p. 352.

[60] Toprak, p. 11.

a correlation between the recruitment of a considerable part of the able young males to the military and the decrease in labor force in agricultural production on a large scale.[61] In the same way, so as to solve the problem of the transportation of ammunition, draught animals were confiscated by the army. Accordingly, people who were behind the front had difficulty finding oxen to cultivate their lands. In the end, as Ali Eşiyok adds that in the beginning of the 1920s, Turkey faced problem importing a large proportion of its basic consumption goods, such as wheat, flour and sugar.[62]

The academic literature on the agriculture of the1920s asserts despite the 50 percent decline in agricultural production in the long periods of war, pre-war agricultural production was obtained. Underlying reason for agricultural development was the increase of employment in the agricultural sector by means of peacetime, the return of the male population of Anatolia and Thrace to cultivation, the development in health services and migrations from Balkans. Besides, positive price and unit price trends along with the peace environment encouraged peasants to engage in agricultural production. As an example, double increase in wheat production from 1920 to 20,000,000 tons occurred in 1929.[63] Similarly, around 80 percent of population was peasant between 1920 and 1960[64]. The rest of the population was employed in service sector and industrial sector.

[61]Ali Eşiyok, *Kalkınma Sürecinde Tarım Sektörünün Ekonomideki Yeri Yapısı ve Gelişme Dinamikleri (1923-2004*) (Ankara, Türkiye Kalkınma Bankası A.Ş, 2004), p. 13

[62]Eşiyok, *Kalkınma Sürecinde Tarım Sektörünün Ekonomideki Yeri Yapısı,* pp. 13-14.

[63] Ibid., p. 13.

[64] Yahya S. Tezel, *Cumhuriyet Döneminin İktisadi Tarihi,* p. 102.

Cultivable Lands and the Characteristics of landholding in the 1920s

No doubt, cultivable lands were one of the most important parts of agricultural structures. Başer and İnci mainly deal with legal regulations for the distribution of state land, taxation, credits, and mechanization. Although agricultural policies in the 1920s are presented as private ownership and private saving- oriented in historiography, Varlı points out that there were statist agricultural policies in the 1920s.[65] This mainly results from the intervention and regulation of the state in land distribution. The state also aimed to increase agricultural production both for trade and food requirement of cities

So as to explain the underlying reason of land distribution in 1920s, İnci pays an attention to landowning legacy and distribution of landownership that remained from Ottoman period. According to statistical data of agricultural census in 1912, almost 87 percent of peasant families owned 35 percent of agricultural lands, worse than that 8 percent of peasant families who had no land. However, only 5 percent of peasant families owned 65 percent of agricultural lands.[66]

It is well known academic view in most of the secondary literatures that there was abundant soil by comparison with scarce labor force. Similarly, in the relations of production there were big landownership, mostly small scale, medium sized enterprises and also the system of sharecropping in the agricultural sector. By "small scale enterprise," farmers who had less land and produced under the level of

[65]Arzu Varlı,"Devletçilik Politikalarının Tarım Kesmi Üzerindeki Etkileri (1930-1940)" *Marmara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Öneri Dergisi* 10, no. 38 (2012) , p. 114.

[66]İbrahim İnci, "Atatürk Dönemi Türkiyesinde Toprak Mülkiyet Dağılımı İle İlgili Bazı Düzenlemeler" *A.Ü Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, no. 44 (2010), pp. 346-347.

substance income are indicated.[67] By "medium sized enterprises," farmers who produced at the level of substance are meant. Also by "big business" or "big landownership," farmers who had excessive income are meant.[68]

As a common point, most secondary sources state that the agricultural methods depended upon climate conditions, draught animals, and intensive labor force in cultivation. The size of agricultural land was on the average smaller than ten dönüm for each family. Thus it was far from providing substance for one family.[69]Besides, Başer writes that land structure determined the proportion of agricultural size changed from one region to region in the country in the 1920s. For example, while agricultural lands were smaller in Eastern Black Sea region, they were larger in Aegean region. In 1927 years, 76 percent of villagers cultivated 7 percent of cultivable lands. [70]

The Encouragement of Private Ownership

Basically, the decisions taken at the İzmir Economic Congress in 1923, Constitution of 1924 and Cadastral Code in 1925 supported the right of private property and road map of the general economic policies in the 1920s.[71] Furthermore, Toprak takes back the legal base of private property to Tanzimat Reform Era. The

[67] Kadir Başer, "1923-1950 Yılları Arasında Türkiye de Toprak Dağılımı ve Toprak Reformunun Politik Sonuçları," *Dumplupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, no. 38 (October, 2013), p. 204.

[68]Başer, "1923-1950 Yılları Arasında Türkiye de Toprak Dağılımı," pp. 204-205.

[69]İnci, "Atatürk Dönemi Türkiyesinde Toprak Mülkiyet Dağılımı," p. 348.

[70]Başer, p. 207.

[71] Ibid., p. 350.

Land Code of 1858, Civil Code and Obligations Code of 1926 reinforced the principle of private ownership- oriented production.[72]

Public lands *(miri)* underlay the Ottoman land system. Tithe was one of the supplementary elements of the Ottoman land system. However, the tithe was generally taxed on the gross revenue of land so it dissuaded many villagers from producing. In the same way, since the tithe was an excess burden of tax on farmers, it prevented capital accumulation in rural areas in the production process. Through the entry into force of the Civil Code, and based upon article 43of Applicable Law, public land system was abolished. [73]

The abolition of tithe increased the number of small farmers.[74] Rather than taxation on gross revenue, taxation of income encouraged farmers to produce more, to acquire more capital and to increase private ownership[75] Almost no farmers had been content with confiscation and tithe, thus, the abolition of the *Miri* system and tithe made it easier increase agricultural output and to enjoy fairness with regard to rule of the law. Thus burden of tax was directed from rural areas to urban lands.[76]

The Roots of Landownership in Early Republican Era

Constitution of 1924 failed to provide fair distribution of lands. The appearance of big landownership stemmed from different factors such as the uncertainties in the land registry system, the occupation of strong families as sole

[72]Toprak, p. 21.

[73] Hüseyin Topuz, " Cumhuriyet Ekonomisinde Tarımsal Yapının İncelenmesi (1923-1950)," *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi* 12, no. 3 (2007), p. 380.

[74] Toprak, p. 13.

[75] Topuz, p. 380.

[76] Toprak, p. 22.

proprietors of the lands[77] that remained from the Christians who had left and the dispossession of many peasants through indebtness to usurers.[78]

Insufficient credit facilities led many farmers acquire money from usurers, merchants, or big landowners. When they could not pay back their loans with interest rate, many peasants lost their lands in a historical process. This also prevented stability in small scale enterprise. Kazgan notes that since the cadastral plan of Turkey had not been prepared completely, people attributed their claim of owner to mixed documents that were regulated in 1912 agricultural census. However, old land registries were fulls of uncertainties after First World War.[79] These uncertainties in title documents made difficult the distribution of lands to immigrants, landless villagers and refugees.[80] Similarly, the parliamentary speech of Şükrü Kaya in 1934 reveals the attempts of *Ayaan* families (landed proprietor). Many landed proprietors brought suit based upon New Civil Code in 1926. Thus they won many cases and averted many landless villagers and immigrants from these lands.[81]

Keyder states that million dönüm of land that had belonged to from Armenians who migrated in 1915 and from Greeks, who had emigrated in 1923 as a result of the Lausanne Treaty were shared among influential families in rural areas.[82]Thus the appropriation of non Muslim goods was other means of big landownership. In the same way, in accordance with the policy of national economy, capital were handed to Muslim Turks. The creation of a Muslim Turkish bourgeois

---

[77] Cemil Çalgüner*, Arazi Mülkiyet Rejimi ve Türkiyedeki Durum (*Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Ziraat Fakültesi Yayınları,1970), pp. 41-42.

[78] İnci, p. 350.

[79]Gülten Kazgan*, Tarım ve Gelişme* (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Yayınları, 1977), p. 584

[80] İnci, p. 351.

[81] Ibid., p. 351; Republic of Turkey, Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi Zabıt Ceridesi, term.5, vol.6, 1934.

[82]Keyder*, Dünya Ekonomisi içinde Türkiye (1923-1929)* (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1982), p. 37.

was regarded as supporting of the political gains with economic ones and the consolidation of the basic tenets of the republic. Thus, these influential families in local areas legitimated their usurpations through the private ownership policy in Constitution of 1924. [83]

By "big landowners," I mean landowners who have cultivable land over 500 dönüm. During the Turkish National Independence War, the big landowners played an important role. According to Tezel, the RPP government seems to have been on the part of the big landowners at first but governor intellectual cadre considered the support of villagers economically necessary for their political interests in the long run. Besides, through land distribution and educational policy of the RPP government, the traditional ties, the authority of village headmen and religious leaders were tried to be broken on the way to create modern citizens and provide the citizens with the principles of the rule of law. [84].

On the other hand, in some cases these economic policies of the government to develop the socio economic welfare of small and medium size enterprises were a disadvantage to the big landholders. Similarly, since mechanization was at low level, the big landowners needed to hire more landless men and sharecroppers to cultivate their lands.[85] Furthermore, during the İzmir Economic Congress in 1923 the demand of small- scale farmers for land distribution was rejected by the top producers.[86] The big landowners became influential during this congress.

---

[83] Gülden Çamurcuoğlu, "Türkiye Cumhuriyeti nin Toprak Reformu ve Milli Burjuvasi Yaratma Çabası" *Gazi Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi*, 8 (2009), p. 162; Cemil Çalgüner, *Arazi Mülkiyet Rejimi ve Türkiyedeki Durum* (Ankara : Ankara Üniversitesi Ziraat Fakültesi Yayınları, 1970), p. 41-42

[84] Tezel, p. 343.

[85]Ibid., p. 343.

[86]Çamurcuoğlu, "Türkiye Cumhuriyeti nin Toprak Reformu" p. 169.

Regarding land distribution and cultivable lands, Tezel and Başer explain the process of land distribution and the expansion of agricultural land clearly. Between 1923 and 1950, 1,500,000 hectares of lands were distributed to almost 430,000 families across Turkey. Similarly, almost half of this was given to 190,000 Turkish originated immigrant families from Greece after the population exchange between Turkey and Greece in 1923. The rest of 760,000 hectares was given to 240,000 local rural families who owned small land or lacked of any land.[87] Similarly, from 1925 onwards, the draining of swamplands added agricultural lands in many areas.[88] If it is taken into consideration the agricultural methods in which there was no irrigation and no fertilization, gaining new lands was important to provide with agricultural production. According to the statistical data of the1927 agricultural census, the total amount of cultivable land was almost 44,000,000 dönüm.[89]

Between 1912 and 1922, government encouraged the use of tractors so as to prevent scarcity in labor force, to increase agricultural output and to prevent scarcity of food. [90] In the same way, farmers who had tractor and motor cars were exempt from military service. However, the first tractors in the early Republican era were not suitable for hard soil.[91]

100 tractors were sold in Adana in 1924.[92] It was estimated that 10 percent of agricultural land was cultivated through tractors in Adana region.[93] The number of

[87] Tezel, p. 358.

[88] Başer, p. 204.

[89] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Census (1927),* p. 101.

[90] İlhanTekeli and Selim İlkin "Devletçilik Dönemi Tarım Politikaları," p. 83.

[91] Toprak , p. 34.

[92] Tekeli and İlkin, p. 83.

[93] Oya Silier, *Türkiye de Tarımsal Yapının Gelişimi* (*1923-1938*) (İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınevi, 1981), pp. 18-24.

tractors increased from 500 to 1200 in 1928.[94] However, since the land structure, the extent of agricultural land and agricultural crops differed; a generalization cannot be made for whole country. When the statistical data of the Agricultural Census of 1927 is taken into account, it is seen that in the first years of Turkish Republic agricultural manufacturing technology was utmost primitive. General characteristics of agricultural sector in the 1920s were similar to that of the 1900s. Based on the Agricultural Census of 1927, the total number of tractors, lawn mowers and binders was about 16,000 [95]

Credit Facilities in 1920s

Agricultural Bank took an institutional role in providing credit facilities to farmers. The wheat purchasing policy of the Agricultural Bank was to some extent for the benefit of the peasants until 1938.[96] With a law in 1924, the Agricultural Bank was turned into a stock joint company for almost 100 years. In this sense, while its bank capital was 30 million in 1924, this increased to 100 million lira in 1930.[97] Agricultural mechanization, wheat purchasing, credit extension and the encouragement of home production were among the missions of Agricultural Bank. [98] In other words, in one party period of the Republican People's Party, Agricultural Bank undertook locomotive function in agricultural sector.[99]

---

[94] Toprak, p. 33.

[95] Eşiyok, p. 16.

[96] Nadir Özbek "Kemalist Rejim ve Populizmin Sınırları: Büyük Buhran ve Buğday Alım Politikaları (1932 -1937)," *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 96 (2003), p. 237.

[97] Toprak, p. 24.

[98] Murat Koraltürk "1923-1960 Türkiye Ekonomisi," *Yeni Türkiye Yayınları* 17 (2002), pp. 581-197.

[99] Toprak, p. 24.

In the 1920s, substance farming was widespread; the source of capital saving, in agriculture was agrarian oriented credits. These credits funded by state and a usurer market. According to the calculations of Bulutay and his friends, the credits that were provided by Agricultural Banks to farmers was more than 20 percent of total credits between 1927 and 1932.[100] On the contrary, there was also a rate of informal credits supplied by usurers. The rate of these credits was 70 percent of total credits. [101]

Between 1923-1929, with the positive influence of World market and with the government investment in agriculture, marketing processes became in favor of agricultural structure. The internal terms of trade developed at a rate of almost 45 percent for the benefit of wheat, by the end of the 1920s. At the same time, in the categories of tobacco Industry and cotton industry, internal terms of trade developed in favor of tobacco and cotton producers.[102]

Koraltürk and Emgili point out that there was a close relationship between population exchange in 1923 and the changes of agricultural crops. Similarly, the deportation of local Greek population who had specialized in the cultivation of tobacco, cotton and grape led to a decrease in the production of these crops by half. Furthermore, the cultivated size of cereal crops constituted almost 90 percent of total agricultural lands from1928 onwards.[103] The rate of industrial crops was 6 percent and the rate of legumes was 4 percent in these cultivated lands.[104] Similarly, while the average annual economic growth rate in the agricultural sector was 16 percent,

[100] Ibid., p. 15.

[101] Eşiyok, pp. 16-17.

[102] Ibid., p. 16.

[103] Özbek "Kemalist Rejim ve Populizmin Sınırları" p. 237.

[104] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Census (1927),* p. 14.

the average annual economic growth rate was 9 percent in industrial sector.[105] The Turkish Republic which was a clear cut importer country until the end of the 1920s rose to the position of exporter in the end of the1930s.[106]

The Great Depression and Its Influence on the Agricultural Sector

Even though the Great Depression was centered European and United States, it influenced industry and agricultural sectors throughout the world. Eventually, many countries in Europe, Asia and the US were doing business in open price system in the 20 century. Supply and demand relations and fluctuations in the world markets influenced Turkey.

This thesis examines how this international economic crisis influenced agricultural prices, landownership and mechanization in Turkish agriculture. While international terms of trade were to the detriment of the national economy, the internal terms of trade had a negative of agriculture. Pamuk indicates a decline in the export rate of some agricultural crops such as tobacco, grape and cotton, resulting a depression period for Turkish agriculture.[107]Similarly, the price of agricultural crops was so sensitive to economic fluctuations.[108]In socio-economic life, the purchasing power of agricultural crops declined by 30 percent at the beginning of 1930s.[109] For example, one kilogram of wheat declined almost from 13 TL to 4, 31 TL.[110]

---

[105] Eşiyok, p. 6.

[106] Pamuk, " İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılların da Devlet Tarımsal Yapılar ve Dönüşüm," p. 95.

[107] Ibid., p. 92.

[108] Ergün Kip"Türkiye'de Taban FiyatlarıDestekleme Alımları ve İç Ticaret Hadleri, in *Türkiye'de Tarımsal Yapılar (1923-2000)"* eds. Şevket Pamuk and Zafer Toprak,(Ankara: Yurt Yayınları, 2008), p. 136.

[109] Tezel, p. 216.

[110] Kip"Türkiye'de Taban FiyatlarıDestekleme Alımları ve İç Ticaret Hadleri," p. 139

Geographically, this economic depression was felt more seriously in the regions where market-oriented production was made.[111]

Furthermore, Tekeli and İlkin assert that both adverse influence of drought in 1928 and the Great Depression caused many peasants to sell their lands.[112] Small scale enterprises that produced at the level of subsistence farming were in danger of being forced to sell their lands and draught animals. Medium and large-scale producers who made market- oriented production were influenced by both the negative mobility in the market and the decline in production. [113]

In terms of the effects of the Great Depression on agricultural mechanization, the agricultural infrastructure was not sufficient in terms of the educational level of peasants, petroleum and spare parts; therefore, the use of tractor in agricultural land declined. Furthermore, this decline came to a head in 1933.[114] Similarly, for a brief period the government encouraged the use of draught animals in cultivation.[115] In the cultivation of lands extensive agricultural methods that based on climate conditions were used.[116] Thus, the supply of agricultural products took a long time and supplies were at low level.[117]

Within the scope of taking a measure, Keynesian and protectionist economic policies were thought as a remedy by the RPP government. The RPP government implemented protectionist policies to bring the country out of the depression. Similarly, the RPP government created a more centralized and introverted economic

[111] Toprak, p. 13.

[112]Tekeli and İlkin, p. 37.

[113]Pamuk, p. 92.

[114]Toprak, p. 23.

[115]Tekeli and İlkin, p. 85.

[116] Kip, p. 139.

[117] Ibid., p. 136.

system that conformed to its political preferences. Therefore, especially from 1932 onwards, a state funded industry policy was conducted.[118] Furthermore, although government played an important role in the economic area, the purpose of this new policy, known as etatism, was not the elimination of private enterprise. Similarly, the initiations of the state projects were considered to be vital for national development and defense.[119] At the time, when the price of agricultural crops declined, the government moved to support industry.

State Investments in Agriculture in the 1930s

In the 1930s, Toprak, Tekeli and İlkin explain how the Agricultural Ministry, the Agricultural Enterprises Institutions, the Agricultural Combines Enterprises, State Farms and the Agricultural Bank took on an important task. Especially, after 1932, in agricultural research, agricultural education, the use of technology, the organization of agricultural credits and marketing of agricultural crops, these institutions were in touch with the peasants.[120] The underlying reason for these research and development investments was to overcome the Great Depression of 1929 through limited capital and scarce resources.[121]

[118] Pamuk, pp. 91-108.

[119] Aresvik, *The Agricultural Development of Turkey*, p. 3.

[120] Tekeli and İlkin, p. 42.

[121] Toprak, p. 30.

Research and Development Investments in Agriculture

So as to provide agricultural yields, the improvement of seeds and research on plant growth at the State Farms had an important place in the agricultural economy of the RPP. The Station of Antalya Warm Climate Plants, the Lüleburgaz State Farm and the Station of Kayseri *Alfalfa* Trying and so on were among the examples of state farms. Similarly, these government institutions acted as a laboratory in agrarian developments.[122] Regarding the improvement of seeds in the field of agriculture, Tekeli and İlkin specify that it could be realized in three phases. First, with improvements and testing stations, new plants species were improved. Second, the most favourable growing techniques of the plants that were found in the test fields were researched. Third, the seeds that were improved at the state farms were grown sufficiently and distributed to villagers[123]

Regarding agricultural mechanization in the 1930s, Agricultural Combines Administration informed villagers on the subjects of agricultural mechanization and pesticides in 1937.[124] Similarly, the Agricultural Equipment Institution provided acquired agricultural machines, agricultural fertilizers and pesticides from domestic and foreign markets. Besides, this institution sold these materials to farmers in cash or by instalments. [125]

According to the Statistics of Agricultural equipment and machineries in 1939, between 1932 and 1938, 185 *selektör* (seed cleaning machines) were

[122] Ibid ., p. 26.

[123] Tekeli and İlkin, p. 42.

[124] Ibid ., p. 49.

[125] Ibid., p. 87.

distributed to different parts of Turkey.[126]Thanks to this machine, both better qualified products and seed dressing could be provided. Between 1923 and 1933, almost 20,000 tons of wheat seed were cleaned.[127] There were 54,000 harrows, almost 3,000 seed sowing machines and almost 2,500 binders.[128]

In the first half of the 1930s, agricultural production was stagnant but through increasing government assistances such as credits, fertilizer, seed and machines, the agricultural sector recovered remarkably in the second half of the 1930s.[129] Regarding agricultural production, there was between 50 percent and 70 percent increase in agricultural production during the 1930s.[130] However, behind of this increase, the enlargement of cultivable lands by means of land distribution and the use of fertilizers were influential from 1920 onwards. By the same token, the use of fertilizers was 404 tons in 1924, 1582 tons in 1926 and back down almost1400 tons in 1938.[131]

Agricultural Education in the 1930s

The RPP government tried to spread the use of modern technology and new findings about plant growing in the state farms in 1930s.[132] These efforts were realized through education. Two types of educational methods were followed, public education and university education.

[126]Toprak, p. 34.

[127] Mirza Gökköl, *Türkiye Buğdayları* (İstanbul: TC Ziraat Vekaleti Yayınları, 1935), p. 258.

[128] İbrahim İnci, 06 December 2011, Atatürk'ün Direktif ve Tavsiyeleri Işığında Türk Tarımındaki Gelişmeler (1923-1938), http://www.isteataturk.com/haber/6540/ataturk-8217un-direktif-ve-tavsiyeleri-isiginda-turk-tarimindaki-gelismeler-1, [06 December 2011]

[129] Pamuk, p. 95.

[130] Ibid., pp. 91-108.

[131] Tezel, p. 375.

[132] Toprak, p. 24.

The government opened courses to train the instructors in areas such as agriculture, husbandry, silkworm breeding, apiculture, and handicrafts.[133] Based on the economic activities in different regions, these courses were opened by state. Instructors were assigned to villages with populations less than 150.[134] These young people could be regarded as counsellors. They would guide the peasant in pastoral life and in the political doctrines of the republican regime.[135] The first course was opened in Mahmudiye village close to the Çifteler Village Institute in Eskişehir.[136] The number of candidates to be instructor was almost 80. They took a course almost seven months in Mahmudiye State Farm.[137] Then it spread to distinct regions and the number of instructors increased to 500.[138] In this way, the government aimed to increase the knowledge and skills of people in the agricultural sector.

Following modern scientific developments in Europe and the reports of a committee governed by Oldenburg in 1928[139]and the foundation of the Agricultural Institute in Ankara in 1933 were among the guides of agricultural education of the Republican People's Party government. Similar to Forestry and Veterinary Medicine, the Agricultural Faculty was one of the first departments in Ankara University.[140] There were some Jewish scientists who escaped from Nazi Germany in different

---

[133] Ibid., p. 24.

[134] Çiğdem Erdem"Cumhuriyet Yönetiminin 1930' lu Yıllarda Köyde ve Köylülükte Dönüşümü Gerçekleştirme İsteğinin Bir Aracı Olarak Köy Eğitmen Kursları" *Gazi Üniversitesi İktisadi İdari Bilimler Dergisi* 10, no. 3 (2009), p. 193.

[135] Erdem"Cumhuriyet Yönetiminin 1930' lu Yıllarda Köyde ve Köylülükte Dönüşümü Gerçekleştirme İsteğinin Bir Aracı Olarak Köy Eğitmen Kursları" p. 193.

[136] Feridun Bayram *Eğitmenler, Öğrenmeyi Öğretme Ustaları* (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1999), p. 20.

[137]Erdem, p. 193.

[138] Toprak, p. 24.

[138] Ibid., p. 26.

[139] Sevtap Kadıoğlu, "Ankara Yüksek Ziraat Enstitüsünde Mülteci Bilim Adamları"*Osmanlı Bilimi Araştırmaları Dergisi* 9, no.1-2 (2007-2008), p. 185.

[140]Toprak, p. 24.

branches of Istanbul University. In addition, there were some German scientists who were assigned to Agricultural Institute in Ankara by German government between 1933 and1942.[141]Some of them were Wilhelm Solomon, Otto Gerngross, Hans Bremer and Max Pfannenstiel.[142] The German intellectuals created the curriculum in the Agricultural Faculty of Ankara University.[143] With the start of Second World War and because of the worsening formal relations between Turkey and Germany, most of these men returned to Germany.[144] One of their common characteristic was that they took charge of important geological, agricultural institutions and relevant ministries as researchers and advisors thus they contributed to the development of science in Turkey.[145]

The Roles of the Agricultural Bank, Agricultural Cooperatives and the Commodity Exchange Markets in the 1930s

Toprak and Özbek clearly signify the underlying reason for the Law of Wheat in 1932 and wheat purchases of the Agricultural Bank. Firstly, in addition to speculative enterprises, sharp decreases in price sickened farmers.[146]For example, while the decline in the price of wheat was almost 60 percent in the US, it was almost 70 percent between 1928 and 1931. Furthermore, in comparison with other agricultural products, such as cotton and tobacco, the purchasing power of wheat

[141] Kadıoğlu, "Ankara Yüksek Ziraat Enstitüsünde Mülteci Bilim Adamları," p. 183.

[142] Fahri Türk Servet Çınar "Türkiye İle Almanya Arasında Bilimsel İlişkiler: Türk Alman Üniversiteleri" *Akademik Bakış Dergisi* 7, no. 13 (Winter 2013), p. 50.

[143]Toprak, p. 24.

[144]Kadıoğlu, p. 186.

[145] Fritz Neumark, *Boğaziçine Sığınanlar, Türkiye'ye İltica Eden Alman İlim, Siyaset ve Sanat Adamları (1933-1953)* (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Maliye Bölümü Yayını, 1982) , pp. 11-15.

[146]Toprak, p. 23.

decreased 50 percent. [147] To prevent price fluctuations and to provide agricultural support, the Agricultural Bank was authorized to buy notably wheat and other cereal crops at higher prices in 1932.[148] Furthermore, although the population of Turkey increased until the mid of the 1930s, wheat production was scarcely enough to make a bread.[149]The price of one kilogram of wheat was at 5 kuruş.[150] Transportation facilities and circulation of agricultural crops were not provided sufficiently.[151]To prevent price differences that resulted from seasonal and regional differences and provide fair cash value[152], the government established 24 commodity exchange markets such as in İstanbul, Samsun, Uzunköprü, İzmir, Bursa, Adapazarı, and Eskişehir and so on in 1924.[153]

Since many peasants lacked title deeds, they could not provide any guarantee to the Bank. Therefore, underlying reason for the Agricultural Cooperatives was to provide peasants with joint surety.[154] Similarly, the Government sought associate status in providing loans.[155] Especially for exported agricultural crops, the foundation of sale cooperatives was emphasized at the agricultural congress in 1931.[156] Sale cooperatives broke the monopoly of the export merchants who prevented the development of these cooperatives. Thanks to legal regulations, the financial progress and supervision of both agricultural credits cooperatives and agricultural

[147] Özbek, p. 227.

[148] Toprak, p. 23.

[149] Özbek, p. 228.

[150] Kip, p. 139.

[151]Toprak, p. 24.

[152] Ibid ., p. 23.

[153] Özbek, p. 224.

[154] İnci, "Atatürk'ün Direktif ve Tavsiyeleri Işığında Türk Tarımındaki Gelişmeler," p. 8

[155]Tezel, p. 366.

[156] Ibid ., p. 216.

sales cooperatives were assigned to the Agricultural Bank in 1935. Thus, a considerable part of government policies in agriculture were formed as a result of current conditions rather than a planned roadmap. The Agricultural Credit Cooperatives were established in 1924. Towards the end of the 1920s there were 65 cooperatives with 4000 members. Towards the end of the1930s, there were almost 600 cooperatives and 114,000 members.[157]

Cultivated Lands and Agricultural Production in the1930s

Since some forest lands and pasture lands were turned into cultivated land from 1929 to 1939, there was an increase in the size of cultivated lands. Thus cultivated lands showed increase at the level of 42 percent.[158] Between 1934 and 1938, the distribution of public lands to landless villagers was almost 300,000 hectares.[159] Tezel signifies that the land distribution project of government continued in 1938; however it was interrupted by the Second World War.[160] Almost 11 percent was field, 2, 6 percent of lands for vegetables and 15 percent was spare land for agriculture of Turkish lands in 1930s.[161] Pamuk points out the importance of labour force. Since the children who were born in 1922 reached the age of employment in agricultural sector, there was qualified man power in 1939.[162] However with conscription to the army, many of them could not engage in production process.

[157] Ibid ., p. 366.

[158] Pamuk, p. 96.

[159] Eşiyok, p. 17.

[160] Tezel, p. 351.

[161] Tekeli and İlkin, p. 40.

[162] Pamuk, p. 96.

In terms of the production and export rates, Pamuk and Kazgan conclude that Turkish economy overcame the depression after 1935.[163] When the vegetable production level in 1939 compared to that of 1929, it increased at 63 percent. When it is regarded the data of cereal exportation, the Turkish Republic became a net exporter by the end of 1930s, Turkey rose in the position of clear cut exporter country.[164] Based on all these data, the1930s cannot be seen as an uninterrupted period of depression for agricultural production. [165] The cultivation area was around 86,000,000 dönüm in these years.[166]

The Agricultural Policy of Government during the 1940s

Even though Turkey did not participate in the Second World War actively, it felt the danger and difficulties of the war in terms of its military, economy and politics. The geostrategic position of Turkey and the unreliable war environment on the international level put Turkey to be on full alert throughout the WWII. As a more prominent issue, the Turkish economy was in dire straits in the 1940s. Between 1940and 1945, average annual rate of economic growth decline was 5 percent in industry, 7 percent in the agricultural sector and 6 percent in national income.[167] The average cultivation area decreased to 75,000,000 dönüm in war period.[168]

Through some tax laws, such as the National Protection Law in1940, the Capital Tax in 1942 and the Soil Product Tax in 1944, government policies aimed to

[163] Gülten Kazgan, *Tarım ve Gelişme*, p. 584.

[164] Pamuk, p. 95.

[165] Ibid., p. 96.

[166] Republic of Turkey, *The Summary of Agricultural Statistics (1939-1959)* (Ankara: Prime Ministry, 1960), pp. 4-5.

[167] Eşiyok, p. 19.

[168]Republic of Turkey, *The Summary of Agricultural Statistics (1939-1959)*, pp. 4-5.

intervene in the production processes of agricultural crops. Thus government aimed to collect sufficient amount of agricultural crops within the body of Soil Product Office so as to provide for the food requirements of the cities and the army during the years of the Second World War.

Beyond of the intensive diplomatic traffic between Turkey and the European powers, the influence of government policy on socio-economic life, in particular to the agricultural sector. Provided that we take into account 80 percent of people still lived in rural areas and agriculture made up almost half of GDP, it is easy to understand to what extent the economic regulations of government influenced on the agricultural sector.

The Relations between Employment and Production in the 1940s

Briefly, if the influence of international conditions in the historical process is taken into account the agricultural policy of the Turkish Government was shaped by the immigration from the Balkans in the 1920s and Great Depression in the 1930s. As a legal remedy, the provision of land policy within the scope of private ownership in the 1920s and also protectionist governmental policies was implemented to increase agricultural yield in the 1930s. However, due to the danger of war, rather than direct investments and land distribution, generally government supervised agricultural production process and the sale of agricultural crops to maintain the prices equilibrium in the 1940s.

Regarding population and economic production, Pamuk and Toprak mainly emphasize that the recruitment of almost one million young males who were qualified labour force in agricultural sector into the military, decline in the birth rate

and the immigrations from Balkans to Turkey led to less amount of food supply that triggered food shortages, an active black market, and the danger of famine in urban areas. These young populations turned from producer position to consumer position. Because some agricultural lands could not be cultivated, elderly and children died due to malnutrition and inadequate health conditions.[169]

Similarly, when the statistics of the migrations from Bulgaria to Turkey in the 1940s are compared with those of the 1930s, ten times decrease can be seen clearly.[170] Çolak attributes this decrease to the migration policies of Bulgaria, which needed labor force in the war period.[171] In Turkey, owing to the decreasing immigrant population and recruitment of young male population, the economy, which mainly depended on the agricultural sector came to a standstill during the WW II.

The insufficient infrastructure system of Turkey made the transportation of agricultural crops from one region to another difficult. This caused a closed economic system of most Anatolian and Thracian towns. Furthermore, during war period, the problem in the transportation of foodstuffs came to light. Since 300,000 tons of wheat could not be transported from the fields to the barracks, only 150 grams of bread fall to per soldier.[172] Thus, Turkey experienced the scarcity of food both in military and cities.[173]

---

[169] Pamuk, p. 96.

[170] Filiz Çolak"Bulgaristan Türklerinin Türkiye'ye Göç Hareketi 1950-1951"*Tarih Okulu Dergisi*, no. 14 **(**Spring 2013), p. 118.

[171]Çolak, "Bulgaristan Türklerinin Türkiye'ye Göç Hareketi," p. 118.

[172] Mehmet Arif Demirer, *Atatürk Bayar ve Menderes EksenindeMasallar ve Gerçekler* (Ankara: Lazer Yayınları, 2005), p. 102.

[173]Pamuk, p. 98.

Economic Interventionism of Government during War Period

Pamuk expresses that the supply of food requirements of the army and cities could be received in two ways by the government. The first was state a controlled economy in which the state conducted a price policy through intervention in agricultural production and trade. When people were not content with the interventionist economic policy of the government, they became involved in hoarding, profiteering, and black market. Both the prevention of inflation and keeping prices at reasonable levels were aimed at this policy. The second way, Pamuk points out free market economy in which government was as far as possible from intervening in the economic process. In free market economy, increase in price and demand encouraged suppliers to produce more.[174]

Pamuk and Şener expressed how the RPP followed the principle of economic interventionism and tried to monopolize the economic and agricultural production processes in order to overcome the scarcity of the food problems of army and cities.[175] This economic policy was legitimised through the enactment of some tax laws such as the Turkish National Security Law in 1940; the Capital Tax in 1942 and the Soil Products Tax in 1944. In wheat purchasing, the Soil Product Office superseded the Agricultural Bank from 1938 onwards.[176]

[174]Ibid., p. 98.

[175]Ibid ., p. 98.

[176] Özbek, p. 219.

The National Protection Law of 1940

In order to fortify national defence during the Second World War, the RPP government enacted Turkish National Protection Law in 1940. Within the scope of this law, the government had authority over price determination, the confiscation of agricultural crops and forced labor. In order to facilitate the decision makings process and to be more coordinating committee that specialized in agricultural economy was established by government.[177]The committee consisted of minister of agriculture, the minister of commerce, minister of finance, minister of economy, and minister of transportation and communication.[178]

Pamuk, Akman and Solak signify how the government intervened not only in the agricultural output, but also in the size of cereal cultivation. The underlying reason for this policy was the important recession in cereals in terms of efficiency and cultivation area in the war period.[179] It appears that wheat production declined almost by half the 1939 levels in 1945.[180] Therefore, government forced every farmer who had more than eight hectares of land to cultivate cereals such as wheat, rye and corn.[181] This situation meant important limitations for the peasants, who cultivated other crops than cereal.[182]

Regarding forced labour, the obligations of the article 37 in the National Protection Law was quite important. In agricultural sector, the efficient regulation on

[177] Sefer Şener, *"İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yıllarında Türkiye de Tarım Politikası Arayışları"Koceli Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* 7, no. 1 (2014), p. 76.

[178] Şener *"İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yıllarında Türkiye de Tarım Politikası Arayışları,"* p. 76.

[179] Pamuk, p. 98.

[180] Ibid ., p.98.

[181] Şefik Taylan Akman, İnci Solak Akman,"İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yıllarında Türkiye de Hububat Üretiminin Vergilendirilmesi" *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi* 2, no.1 (December 2011) , p. 77.

[182]Şener, p. 77.

production means was stipulated.[183] After the peasants completed their own work in their fields, they were taken to government agricultural enterprises *(Devlet Ziraat İşletmesi)* within the scope of compulsory labour. [184] On the condition that it was paid by cash, the state could seize wheat and rye, apart from the amount of subsistence and reserve seed.[185]

Pamuk points out that the enforcement of National Protection Law was not distributed equally among farmers. Predominantly small land holders were obliged to these legal obligations.[186] Small land holders took a dislike to RPP government in time. Mostly, big scale enterprises reacted against the government's implementation by hiding their field crops from the government.[187] Local power relations, traditional ties, and low pricing played important roles in the storage and in the sale of crops. Since the public servants who came to the villages in company of gendarmes were hosted as a guest in the houses of the big landowners, village headmen and notable members of the RPP, these groups were favoured in the determination of their agricultural productions by the public servants. The political decisions that were taken in Ankara did not overlap with the economic interest of the local powers. Therefore while small scale enterprises were obliged to sell their products to Soil and Product Office, big scale enterprises were able to sell their products to merchants that involved in black market economy.[188]

Since the government had difficulty in collecting and transporting agricultural crops from rural areas, this leads to decline in consumption in the cities.

---

[183] Ibid ., p.77.

[184] Ibid.,p.78.

[185] Ibid., p.79.

[186] Şevket Pamuk, *Seçme Eserleri II Osmanlı'dan Cumhuriyet'e Küreselleşme, İktisat Politikaları ve Büyüme* (İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2009), p.191.

[187] Şevket Pamuk, "İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılların da Devlet Tarımsal Yapılar ve Dönüşüm," p. 103.

[188] Ibid ., p.103.

In this sense, with the scarcity of wheat in the big cities, government implemented rationing. In order to prevent secret sales, distribution units were founded,[189] which required certain centres in cities and qualified personnel, developed an infrastructure system and the power of the state administration to ration goods.[190]

In the period of Şükrü Saraçoğlu, in order to please the farmers, to increase production, and to solve the food scarcity, the policies of price determination and seizure of agricultural production were abolished. The RPP government conducted a more liberal and softer interventionist economic policy, but it did not give remarkable results.[191] On the other hand the RPP government maintained the limitations of consumption. Another attempt to solve the problem was to import wheat from the US and Britain but in the long run, this did not help.[192]

The Saraçoğlu government amended the National Protection Law. These changes were regarding legal regulations that necessitated purchasing one quarter, one third and half of the agricultural products in cash. Thus the villagers were allowed to sell rest of their crops. At first this was welcomed by the farmers. However, due to adverse weather conditions and the low price implementation of the government, people continued to hide their crops from state.[193] Since two quarters of the agricultural crops were put aside as seed and for taxation, only half of the grain could be sold freely.[194] Thus, this legal regulation endangered the small scale

[189] Şener, p. 81.

[190] Murat Metinsoy,"Wars outside the War: The Social Impact of The Second World War on Turkey"(MA Thesis, Boğaziçi University, 2004), p.83.

[191]Şener, p. 81.

[192] Ibid ., p. 82.

[193] Ibid ., p.83.

[194] Akman and Solak, "İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yıllarında Türkiye de Hububat Üretiminin Vergilendirilmesi," p. 80.

enterprises. The government neither could nor could stop black market, hoardings and profiteering.

Due to the changing price of wheat, the Soil Product Office had difficulty in collecting wheat. With the internal terms of trade turned out to the advantage of farmers, the difference between the market -determined and state- determined prices of wheat increased. For example, in 1942 while the price of wheat was 50 kuruş per kilogram in the market, the price that was determined by government was 20 kuruş per kilogram.[195] The amounts of wheat bought by the Soil Product Office were almost 1000 tons in 1941. This declined to half in 1942, and also decline one third more in 1943.[196]

Wealth Tax in 1942

In the general atmosphere of scarcity and poverty, the black marketeering and profiteering turned against the RPP. The merchants who acquired significant accumulation in the war period were blamed by the government. Furthermore, Keyder points out that this foreshadowed the end of the alliance between bureaucracy and bourgeois, and also the enactment of the Wealth Tax.[197] This tax was taken from bourgeois, merchants and big landowners. Through Wealth Tax, RPP government tried to decrease the increasing price in market by withdrawing a considerable amount of active money which increase of the demand for goods and

[195] Pamuk, p. 98.

[196] Şener, p. 86.

[197] Keyder, *Türkiye'de Devlet ve Sınıflar,* p. 157.

increased their prices.[198] The RPP government declared this act as the conscription of undeserved gains of merchants who were involved in the black market.

In the levying of the Wealth Tax, some unquestionable tax commissions were formed. Administrative chiefs presided at these committees in local areas. In most cases, due to imperfect data and ethnic discrimination, notably non Muslim bourgeois who lived in İstanbul were mistreated. Similarly, Keyder points out that 65 percent of Wealth Tax was paid by non Muslims and almost three- fourths of tax was collected from İstanbul.[199] To pay the Wealth Tax, two weeks time was given. As a result of foreign intervention, the Wealth Tax was abolished in 1944.

The government tried to find a solution to scarcity of agricultural crops through emphasizing the propaganda of national duty, and self sacrifice.[200] The RPP enacted the Soil Product Tax in 1944. Faik Ökte states that similar to Wealth Tax on non Muslim minorities, peasants were financially straitened.[201]Since it was paid over ten percent of agricultural production, it was like the tithe that had been removed in 1925 by Pamuk, Tezel and Tekeli.[202] With the Soil Product Tax, almost ten percent of income could be provided.[203]

The Soil Product Tax of 1944

In the determination of tax, the pro forma statement of councils, weighing officials, the chief of the village registered taxpayers, estimation branches and

[198]Şener, p. 86.

[199]Keyder, *Türkiye'de Devlet ve Sınıflar*, p. 158.

[200] Akman and Solak, p. 82.

[201] Metinsoy,"Wars outside the War," p. 43.

[202]Şener, p. 88.

[203] Ibid., p. 90.

surveying teams were formed. Estimation branches surveyed agricultural field before the cereals grew mature and wrote down their predictions about total output. [204]The surveying teams were determining the amount of agricultural production in threshing floors. Bribes, corruption, and kinship relations played roles in evading agricultural products in rural areas.[205] Because of the limited transportation facilities, peasants were obliged to bring their agricultural productions to the Soil Product Offices. If the destination was more than 25 km, the government paid freight charges to the farmers per each kilometre.[206] Similar to the Capital Tax, the final decisions of the commissions which were appointed by the highest administrative chief were unquestionable.[207]

As a result, even though the RPP government provided some accumulation, generally, these tax acts were regarded as unsuccessful. Rather than a planned program, the socio-economic conditions directed the policy of government. There were two contradictions in this period. The first was between the scarcity of the labor force and the efforts to increase agricultural production. The other was the collection of grain productions within the body of the Soil Product Office at low prices determined by the government and the formation of a hoarding and black market economy. The war period sharpened the separation between the bureaucracy and the bourgeois. The political implementation of the RPP government turned the villagers who made up of almost 80 percent of the population against the alliance of the RPP government and bureaucracy.

[204]Akman and Solak, p. 84.

[205]Metinsoy, p. 146.

[206] Republics of Turkey,"Toprak Mahsulleri Kanun Vergisi,"*Resmi Gazete,* no. 29238, 26. April 1944.

[207] Akman and Solak, p. 87.

Land Reform Policy in 1945

Apart from land distribution to immigrants from the Balkans in the 1920s and the *Arazi Tevzi Kararnamesi* (Land Distribution Enactment) in the 1930, Karaömerlioğlu and Barkan express that land distribution was not topical issue.[208] However, especially after the mid 1930s and the Second World War, it entered on the agenda of RPP government. In this sense, stating different views as to the reasons for the land distribution well explain the Land Reform in 1945 more completely. Therefore, the reasons of land distribution are discussed in three titles.

The first group of intellectual views dealt with the land distribution in terms of social and economic welfare and also property ownership. Karaömerlioğlu who has studied the peasantry and the socio-economic policies of the RPP in rural areas pointed out that the increasing number of landless peasants or smallholder was one of the basic reasons of land distributions from1930 onwards.[209]Similarly, Öke argues that the through land distribution policy, RPP government aimed to provide the peasants with cultivated land to live off.[210] Similarly, Avcıoğlu stated that the land reform was an attempt by the leftist and the radical wing of the RPP to ameliorate the economic situation of the poor peasants.[211]However it is thought that the failure in the efforts of this group results from their weakness in the face of social force supported by landowners, craft and merchants. Similarly, according to Adnan

[208] Asım Karaömerlioğlu,"Bir Tepeden Reform Denemesi: Çiftçiyi Topraklandırma Kanununun Hikayesi"*Birikim Yayınları, no.107* (March 1998), p. 33.

[209]Karaömerlioğlu,"Bir Tepeden Reform Denemesi,"p. 37.

[210] Mim Kemal Öke Erol Mütercimler, *Yalnızlıktan Saygınlığa Demokrat Partinin Dış Politikası* (Ankara: Ankara Demokratlar Kulübü Yayınları, 2000) p. 128.

[211] Karaömerlioğlu, p. 32.

Menderes who was a politician, Ömer Celal Sarç who was an economist and Niyazi Berkes who was social scientist, Land Reform was made up of Erbhof Law in Germany that prevent the rural mobility.[212] They evaluated Land Reform as a fascist policy that did not care for the importance of private ownership.

The second group evaluated the Land distribution in terms of political reasons specific to solutions to the Kurdish Question. Similarly, Erdal İnce deals with land distribution from social and political perspectives. Moreover, to concrete his view, he assumes the relations between the Settlement law of 1934 and the expropriation of the lands of some Kurdish families.[213] By the same token, Karaömerliğlu states that land distribution was regarded as a solution to the Kurdish Questions but that it failed.[214] After this Law, the land distribution became disputed in RPP government. In order to provide with economic recovery, Ataturk discussed the solving of the problems of landless farmers. [215]In this sense, between 1923 and 1938, 753,000 hectares of land were distributed.[216] However with the outbreak of World War II, these issues were postponed for a while.

The third view is that land distribution was disputed in parliament mainly for political reasons rather than economic reasons. Furthermore, the labour scarcity and the insufficient number of draught animals that led to share cropping. This was permanent problems in the cultivation of land. Therefore there was no serious demand for the land distribution.[217] Considering the fracture between the bourgeois

---

[212]Ibid ., p. 32.

[213] Erdal İnce *"*Köylüyü Topraklandırma Kanunun Türk Siyasal Yapısının Oluşumu Üzerindeki Etkileri," *Çağdaş Türkiye Araştırmaları Dergisi* 5, no.13 (2006), p. 63.

[214] Asım Karaömerlioğlu, *Orda Bir Köy var Uzakta* (İstanbul*:* İletişim Yayınları, 2006) , p. 120.

[215] İnce *"*Köylüyü Topraklandırma Kanunun Türk Siyasal Yapısının Oluşumu Üzerindeki Etkileri,"p. 63.

[216]Tezel, p. 343.

[217]Keyder, *Türkiye'de Devlet ve Sınıflar,* p.174

and the big landowner- supported opponent group in post war period and bureaucracy supported RPP that tried to maintain its political privileges, 80 percent votes of the villagers would be influential on determining the next political power. Therefore, the underlying reason for the RPP populism and conflict with self-contained group in parliament in the 1945 Land Reform was to strengthen their political authority over the voters rather than find a fundamental solution to the socioeconomic problems of the peasants [218]

Based on the Land Reform, abandoned lands and soils that were not cultivated in public affairs were decided to be distributed. However as to the land use, there was some enforcement. First, the fields that weren't cultivated or maintained for three years in succession could be expropriated.[219] Second, serving in the army was another way to acquire land. However, the controversial part of the the land reform was Article17. To some extent, it necessitated the division and expropriation of the agricultural estates of the big landowners who had more than 5000 decars, or those who had more than 2000 decars in regions where agricultural estates were small. Through the imposition of the government, the lands of many big land owners would pass into other hands. [220]

The Land Reform created intense arguments in the Turkish Grand National Assembly. Especially, a group of big landowners led such as Adnan Menderes, Emin Sazak, and Cavit Oral opposed strongly the land reform [221] Furthermore, the disputes between Menderes and Tiridoğlu who were the author of Land Reform proposal,

[218] Ibid ., p.364.

[219] İnce, p. 65.

[220] Karaömerlioğlu,"Bir Tepeden Reform Denemesi" p. 35.

[221] Ibid ., p. 36.

were not only about the content of the law but also wording of the law.[222]As a main problem, while agricultural outputs were sold cheaply, peasants paid high prices for their daily needs.[223] Even though the Land Reform had been approved in the Turkish Grand National Assembly, it could not be implemented wholly. Adnan Menderes, Refik Koraltan, Mehmet Fuat Köprülü, and Celal Bayar gave The Memorandum of the Four to government. Both domestic and foreign atmosphere was suitable, this marked the first step on the way to the foundation of the Democrat Party. Reactions to the socio economic policy of the RPP in the war period and conditions to be a member of the United Nations led the transition to a multi- party system in Turkey in 1946.

The Agricultural Policy of the Turkish Governments between 1948 and 1960

The Influence of the International Atmosphere

In post- war period, how the ideological and economic policy of the US was imagined in the world, how the geostrategic position of Turkey played an important role in Cold War and also how these reflected the mutual relations between two countries in the 1950s will be discussed. The US came out of WW II with the fewest losses and this made it a powerful country in terms of economic, military and political aspects. Taner Timur writes that the USA was in search of a political and economic system that would meet its own needs. On 14 August 1941, Roosevelt and

[222] Süleyman İnan "Toprak Reformunun En Çok Tartışılan Maddesi: 17. Madde"*Journal of Historical Studies*, no. 3 (2005), p. 52.

[223]Karaömerlioğlu,"Bir Tepeden Reform Denemesi," p. 36.

Churchill signed Atlantic Statement that formed the basis of the United Nations and included 26 that were against fascism.[224]

In contrast to League of Nations, the world in the 1940s was a place where various social systems existed together. As a result of anti- imperialist movements, capitalist center lost the monopoly of international markets. In this sense, the US tried to exercise control over raw materials and a broad range of liberal trade throughout the world. [225]

From political point of view, the economic and political influence of the USSR in Eastern Europe and some parts of the Middle East directed the US from cooperation in the international arena to the idea of bipolar world.[226]After Truman, the process of Cold War was felt more and more in the world. This process included a political and economic competition between the US and the USSR. In return the USA formed its political clout through Truman Doctrines, which provided military and financial aid to protect free nations from the threat of communism.

In the Turkish case, USSR demands for border changes in north east Anatolia and for a common defense and military base on the Bosporus led Turkey to join the Western Alliance that defended liberal economies and democratic political principles after WW II. Accepting the Truman Doctrine was an indication of Turkish part in the Cold War process. It was given 100 million dollars to Turkey and three times of this sum of money was given to Greece.

The US implemented Marshall Plan in 1948 to Western European countries that had been adversely influenced by WWII.[227] Another reason of Marshall Plan

---

[224] Taner Timur, *Türkiye de Çok Partili Hayata Geçiş,* 3rd edition (İstanbul: İmge Kitabevi Yayınları, 2003), p.87.

[225]Timur, *Türkiye de Çok Partili Hayata Geçiş*, p. 87.

[226] Ibid., p. 87.

[227] Ibid., p. 92.

was to prevent the influence of communist propaganda in Western Europe. The US imagined a kind of European organization that was economically, politically, and militarily unified against the USSR. In the Turkish case, mostly the Truman Doctrine that was given to Turkey was consisted of only military aid.[228] Furthermore, it did little to help Turkish economy because the maintenance fee and spare part of importing military materials were decreased from the financial part of Truman Doctrines. Therefore Turkey applied to receive economic aid and thus was incorporated into the Marshall Plan in 1948. [229]

In a report that was accepted as a pilot project, the Turkish Republic was regarded in a key position geographically against communism. Hence, essential financial and military aid of the US government and US private enterprise to Turkey were thought to be a precondition of influential US economic policy.[230] In this sense, Turkey participated in the European Reconstruction Programme and undertook some missions in its economic policy.[231]

American Reports on Turkish Agriculture (Hilts, Thornburg and Barker)

Rather than political relations, this thesis is mainly concerned with the economic relations of Turkey with foreign countries. Due to suitable climate conditions, large size of agricultural lands, and the intensively rural settled population and so on, in the Cold War process, Turkey was expected as an export-

[228] Fehmi Akın, *Çok Partili Hayata Geçiş* (Ankara:Anektod Yayınevi, 2008), p. 43.

[229]Akın, *Çok Partili Hayata Geçi,* p. 43.

[230] Timur, p. 95.

[231]Tezel, p. 375.

led agricultural production country to supply with the food needs of the free world, notably Europe.

US specialists produced report, gave suggestion and did some research about the potentials of Turkish economy. In this academic study, three important reports will be discussed briefly. Firstly, the Thornburg Report which introduced the economic potential of Turkey to private sector in the US.[232] The Thornburg Report pointed out the influence of bureaucracy on the production means and production process in the economy and also how this bureaucratic understanding had decelerated economic development in Turkey. Rather than interventionist economic policy of the single party government, it was recommended that the economy work for the whole society.[233] The abandonment of the statist economy and the embracement of liberal economic system were recommended.

Second, the Barker Report was prepared by a specialist of the World Bank who suggested that agriculture was the shortest and quickest way to economic progress rather than industrialization in statist policies.[234]Through these reports and with US funds, from1948 the Turkish economy began to specialize in agricultural production.[235]

Third, the Hilts Report was prepared by an official in Directorate General for Highways. Hilts suggested that highway preferred policy should be followed in the transportation of Turkey. It was as cheaper transportation and supplied the integration of the domestic markets. Avşaroğlu points out that in addition to the foundation of Directorate General for Highways, this necessitated the spread of

[232] Mehmet Arif Demirer, *Atatürk Bayar ve Menderes EksenindeMasallar ve Gerçekler*, p. 100.

[233]Timur, p. 96.

[234] Ibid., p. 97.

[235]Keyder, *Türkiye'de Devlet ve Sınıflar,* p. 166.

vehicles and the use of petroleum. These provided an advantage for the automotive and petroleum monopolies of the US.[236]

The Rise of the Democrat Party

Sociologically the economic policies of the RPP in WWII period alienated a considerable part of the peasant from the RPP government. Keyder argues that since the RPP government made an effort to secure the votes of peasants, the RPP accepted the liberal economic policy and agricultural development project of the US in rural areas.[237] Similarly Toprak and Pamuk states that there were the commodification of production means, the use of pesticides, and mechanization under the leadership of US specialists after the Second World War. In the 1950s when the connections between the urban and rural areas increased through highways, the peasants engaged in market -oriented agricultural production.[238]In general terms, as Turgut claims, these reports and changing economic policy of the government can be interpreted as the reflection of political and ideological preference to the economic policy[239]

The former deputies of the RPP who gave the Memorandum of Four and played important roles in the foundation of the Democrat Party in 1946, came into power four years later. As much as their success came from the economic policy of the RPP during WWII, it stemmed from their close social and economic relations with rural areas and their international political developments. Similarly, Singer

---

[236] Nadir Avşaroğlu, 21 May 2009, *Marşal Planı Amerikan Dış Kredileri ve Türkiye Madencilik Sektörüne Etkileri,* http://www.maden.org.tr/genel/bizden_detay.php?kod=2865&tipi=5, [21 May 2009].

[237] Çağlar Keyder"Tarımda Küçük Meta üretiminin yerleşmesi," p. 163.

[238] Toprak, p.15

[239] Serdar Turgut, *Demokrat Parti Döneminde Türkiye Ekonomisi Ekonomik Kalkınma Süreçleri Üzerine Bir Deneme* (Ankara: Adalet Matbaacılık, 1991), p.136.

writes that the members of the DP were even more willing to pursue the liberal economic policy because of their political liaison with the farm community, their greater commitment to economic expansion and their more conservative ideology.[240] In foreign policy, similar to the suggestions of Barker, Thornburg and Hilts Reports, DP followed liberal economic policy. By liberal economic policy we mean opening to foreign market and market oriented production otherwise, state became influential in agricultural production through agricultural mechanization, the use of pesticides and land distribution policy. Democrats could understand the international economic and political developments more correctly. They became a more agenda setting party after the mid 1940s. Thus, the DP was especially supported in the western regions which had large areas of cultivated lands that were suitable for market- oriented production. As a result of economic aid, the use of technology and the use of manure, and the development of marketing facilities; economic growth was provided to some extent. Furthermore, from the second half of the 1940s to mid 1950s, this growth rate was almost 15 percent.[241].

The Reflections of the Marshall Plan in the Agricultural Sector

The Credit Facilities of the Agricultural Bank

Varlı and Oktar explain that Marshall Aid and credit facilities played important roles in the economic life of peasants. The economic aid that came as a part of the Marshall Plan was distributed as agricultural credits through the Agricultural Bank and the Agricultural Credit Cooperatives. For example thanks to the cheap and long- term credit facilities of the Agricultural Bank, obtaining a loan

[240] Singer, *The Economic Advance of Turkey*, p. 198.

[241] Eşiyok, p. 20.

became easy. Thus the use of credits increased ten times.[242] The amounts of distributing credits were directly proportionate to the size of agricultural lands. [243] The commodification of agricultural lands, the right of landownership and the establishment of the Agricultural Credit Cooperatives made easy loan agreement with the Agricultural Bank. With these credit facilities the DP government tried to increase the share of the private sector in economy. Furthermore, thanks to the credit facilities, the peasants were able to buy their agricultural capitals and cultivate their lands on time. Similarly, the farmers became indebted to the state through legal means. Therefore, when it is compared to 1920s more developed credit facilities had importance in terms of the prevention of usury, providing continuity in production, and landownership.

The Use of Technology in Agricultural lands

Eşiyok attributes quick development in mechanization process to the Marshall Plan.[244] The mechanization in agriculture was the indication of intensive agricultural methods. Similarly to indicate an increase in mechanization, while the number of tractors which was over 1000, increase almost 43 times, the number of draught animals approximately 2, 5 million, remained almost the same.[245] 42,000 tractors corresponded to 2 percent of agricultural enterprises.[246] The number of tractor ploughs used in cultivation was almost 4500 in 1948, but in 12 years, it increased

[242] Varlı and Oktar, "Türkiye'de 1950-1954 Döneminde Demokrat Partinin Tarım Politikası" *Marmara Üniversitesi İ.İ.B.F Dergisi* 28, no. 1(2010), p. 12.

[243] Cem Eroğul, *Demokrat Parti Tarihi ve İdeolojisi* (Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi, 1970), p. 104.

[244] Eşiyok, p. 21.

[245]Keyder, *Türkiye'de Devlet ve Sınıflar*, p. 180.

[246] Demirer, p. 107.

almost 12 times.[247] Making a claim that mechanization in agriculture solved the problem of labor scarcity and production means at the national level, however, might mislead us. Due to the differences in the size of agricultural lands among regions and in new cultivable lands, at first mostly the local elites took advantage of mechanizations.

Briefly, as a result of agricultural mechanization, the enlargement of cultivated lands, the increase in landownership, the increasing demand for spare parts and changes in production relations can be seen in agricultural economy. Thanks to mechanization in agriculture, the total amount of cultivable lands increased 50 percent and thus it became about 14 million hectares.[248] In 1960, agricultural lands increased by almost 80 percent in comparison with 1950 statistics. Peasants could cultivate the lands more easily by the help of tractors. Thus, the rate of landless family decreased. In addition to Pamuk and Toprak, Çağlar Keyder argues that thanks to the capitalist mode of production and private ownership, agricultural fields were commodified and they were marked off from state land.[249] Production relations changed with the use of tractors in agriculture, which lead to the cultivation of more lands. Inter familial labour force gained importance and thus the sharecropping system disappeared.[250] The demands for spare parts increased at the rate of 82 percent between 1950 and 1954.[251] Agricultural mechanisation also increased the use of petroleum, fertilizers and pesticides. Through these methods, the agricultural surplus that was created could be exported.

---

[247]Singer, p. 199.

[248] Keyder, *Türkiye'de Devlet ve Sınıflar* , p. 185.

[249]Ibid., p. 180.

[250] Varlı and Oktar, "Türkiye'de 1950-1954 Döneminde Demokrat Partinin Tarım Politikası," p. 15.

[251] Cem Eroğul, *Demokrat Parti Tarihi ve İdeolojisi,* p. 101.

The Development of Market Oriented Agricultural Production

The cultivation of more agricultural lands and intensive agricultural methods brought about an increase in the variety of agricultural crops. Generally crops notably wheat, sugar beet, cotton and tobacco were among more prominent agricultural crops. Thanks to investments in agriculture, developments in transportation and marketing, Green Revolution that means the increase in the production and efficiency of agricultural crops by means of the use of pesticides, irrigation, chemical fertilizer and the use of more qualified seeds were realized in the 1950s. Between 1951 and 1960, the amount of cereal production showed increase at level of 50 percent and reached at 15 million tons. [252] On the average, the size of cultivated lands was nearly 140,000,000 dönüm in the 1950s.[253]Weather conditions were also important factor in agricultural production. Thanks to the favourable climate conditions, agricultural production increased until 1953.[254]

The Regression in Economic Conditions After 1954

However, due to climate conditions and drought three times in a row 1954 onwards, reaching to the limits of profit in agriculture and the amounts of cultivable lands; agricultural production started to decline in the second half of the 1950s. Similarly, some fluctuations in the levels of agricultural productions became evident,

[252] Ali Eşiyok, *Kalkınma Sürecinde Tarım Sektörünün Ekonomideki Yeri, Yapısı ve Gelişme Dinamikleri (1923-2004)* (Ankara, Türkiye Kalkınma Bankası A.Ş, 2004), p. 22

[253] Republic of Turkey, *The Summary of Agricultural Statistics (1939-1959)*, pp. 4-7.

[254] Ibid., p. 21.

at the rate of 34 percent levels.[255] Since 40 percent of national income came from agriculture, this was important regression.[256]Furthermore, while agricultural income was 50 percent in the beginning of the 1950s, it declined to 46 percent in the late 1950s.[257] Although it was not valid for every region of Turkey, the relation between agricultural mechanization and migration to cities are related in the 1950s. As a result of this migration, there was a shrink by around 8 percent in the rate of employee in the agricultural sector. Thus was around 75 percent. [258]

Agricultural mechanization, the division of labor and the developments in land transportation facilitated socio-economic movement between urban and rural areas.[259] Especially, in the domestic markets, social and economic relations between towns and villages increased. Through market oriented agricultural production, peasant had the ability to transport and sell their productions in the marketplace of towns easily. In addition, migrations from villages to towns created new job opportunities. People started to work in different sectors such as rural industries, salesmanship and public service and so on. With this division of labor, the demands on agricultural crops increased. Furthermore, the number of workers increased from 163,000 to 324,000 in the large plants that mainly appeared in the late 1950s. Similarly, thanks to the socio-economic opportunities of the 1950s, domestic industrial bourgeois emerged.[260]

---

[255] Roger Orwen, Şevket Pamuk, *20yy da Orta Doğu Ekonomileri Tarihi* (İstanbul: Sabancı Üniversitesi Yayınları**,** 2002), p. 146.

[256]Demirer, p. 160.

[257] Yaşar Baytal "Demokrat Parti Dönemi Ekonomi Politikaları (1950-1957) " *Ankara Üniversitesi Türk İnkılap Tarihi Enstitüsü Atatürk Yolu Dergisi*, no.40, (2007) p.558

[258]Baytal, "Demokrat Parti Dönemi Ekonomi Politikaları," p. 558.

[259] Varlı and Oktar, p. 18.

[260] Çağlar Keyder*, Dünya Ekonomisi içinde Türkiye,* pp. 190-193.

In international politics, Turkey was regarded as an agricultural export country that contributed to the strength of free world. Actually, this idea belonged to Russel Dorr, who was the president of the Marshall Plan for Turkish Special Mission.[261] Namely, this may have been provided through development of the transportation system. However, after a while, since Turkey was oil importing country, this economic system increased the use of petroleum. On the one hand, there were some developments in infrastructural investments on the other hand manufacturing technology, and the foreign dependent market economy increased.[262]Thus, Turkey imported agricultural machines, spare parts, and pesticides from abroad.

The rapid economic growth that started at the beginning of the 1950s was realized with the savings of the RPP government that remained from WWII, the foreign aid and the export of agricultural crops at a premium due to the Korean War. However in 1954 years, these incomes started to run short. Moreover, with the end of the Korean War, foreign demand for agricultural crops decreased. Therefore, foreign exchange bottle-neck that resulted from importation led to the end of unplanned and liberal economic policy of the DP 1954 onwards. Similar to war economy (1939-1945), sugar and cement became scarce in this period. For the production of sugar and cement, the government started to found plants. [263]From spare part to coffee almost many imported products were pulled from markets.[264]Similar to the RPP, they also brought back National Protection Law in 1956. The DP government collapsed

[261]Varlı, Oktar, p. 10

[262] Eşiyok, p. 22.

[263] Baytal , p. 556.

[264] Demirer, p. 122.

into inflation that resulted from the delay in the balance of international payments.[265] These economic crises led to the reactions of many people and some the DP deputies.

> On 18 January 1955 from DP group, Kenan Akmazlar, Haluk Timurtaş, Ekrem Canani and Feridun Engin prepared an economic report that criticized their government. In this report the problems in economy were collected under titles of planlessness, expensiveness, black marketing and imported products.[266]

Demirer signifies that neither the opponent party nor the government presented liberal economic policy.[267] Regarding changes in economic policy, the DP government took some drastic measures against imported products. Thus the price of domestic industrial products could be sold with high profits.[268] Namely the DP continued more import substitution industrializations that highlighted domestic market oriented consumer goods.[269] The economic growth of industry exceeded that of agriculture. With 6-7 September Events against Greek in İstanbul, the DP government was discredited in foreign markets. [270] Through Stabilization Program of IMF in 1958, Turkish economy was put on the right track. To some extent this prevented scarcity of foods but general levels of prices increased.[271] In the end the DP government was overthrow by military coup. Then with 1961 Constitution, import substitution industrialization and more planned economic policies were implemented.

---

[265] Baytal, p. 556.

[266] Ibid ., p. 556.

[267]Demirer, p. 123.

[268]Çağlar Keyder, *Türkiye de Devlet ve Sınıflar,* p. 187.

[269]Turgut, p. 173.

[270] Baytal, p. 557.

[271]Demirer, p. 123.

Conclusion

All in all, in this chapter, we do a research on the transformation of agricultural structures by means of government policies during forty years of period. Under the circumstances of these times, every decade, governments showed up with different agricultural policies. Firstly, in the agricultural policies of the 1920s, İzmir Economic Congress and 1924 Constitution became determinant. Private ownership policy, land distribution to Balkan originated immigrants and the removal of tithe were more prominent agricultural policies of the RPP government. More specifically, private ownership and private saving was encouraged by the government. In the transformation of agricultural structures in the 1920s, we tried to explain the influence of population, the roots of land property, agricultural credits, the encouragement of mechanization, and the political approach of government to small and big landowners.

Secondly, the Great Depressions and the decisions of Agricultural Conference in the beginnings of the 1930s determined the road map of the agricultural policies in the 1930s. Government pursued more protectionist policies and statist economy. The agricultural policy was more based on scientific methods which encouraged the use of technology, the attempt of institutionalisation such as State Farms, the Agricultural Combines Administration and the Agricultural Cooperatives. The credit policy of the Agricultural Bank and spread of these developments to people by means of education were the prominent policies of the government. Therefore, we can say that in the 1930s Turkish government took first step on the way to intensive agriculture. Similarly rather than land distribution, government searched the ways more prominently how to supply with agricultural efficiency and agricultural

production. However, lack of sufficient spare part, advanced technology and petroleum were big blocks in implementing mechanization. In this period since the price of agricultural crops was low, state made an investment in industry within the scope of five year development plan.

Thirdly, During the 1940s Turkey experienced the danger of war and the first step to multi party system in 1946. In the first half of the 1940s, unreliable international conditions and geostrategic position of Turkey led government to take some measures related to military and economy. Actually, since 1,200,000 young males who were the most effective group in agricultural production were conscripted to the army, agricultural production declined throughout Turkey. In order to supply the food needs of army and cities, with the enactments of tax acts, the RPP government tried to collect all agricultural products within the body of the Soil Product Office. However, the supply of agricultural crops was low and government purchased with low price on the other hand there was a high demand for these products in market. Therefore peasant tried to evade their crops from the taxation of government. Thus, black market economy became evident in socio-economic life. Namely, the RPP government implemented more interventionist policy rather than sought the ways to increase agricultural production. These policies created deep fractures between peasants and government. Also the coalition between bureaucracy and bourgeois alliance collapsed in Turkish policy. In the end, the economic policies of war period paved the way for new political party.

Finally, after 1948, with cold war period, the political relations between Turkey and America became influential on Turkish economy. Through the Marshall Plan and the American reports, Turkish agriculture was modernized. Similarly, thanks to the use of agricultural inputs and land distribution policy, and market

oriented production both for domestic and foreign markets; higher efficiency and agricultural surplus could be supplied. Due to capitalist mode of production, there was also the commodification of agricultural structures in the 1950s. Thanks to the construction of highways and transportation facilities; market oriented production could be realised. Therefore, the 1950s were characterized as pro global period when green revolution was actualised. However, with the decrease of foreign demand, liberal economic policy started to end after 1954. On the other hand, to some extent agricultural developments in the 1950s were as a result of the economic investments in agricultural sector that had been made since the 1920s. Since most of the population lived in rural areas, agricultural policies had importance for these long period. In every decade, no matter it is liberal or protectionist economic policy, Turkish government dominant power in transformation of agricultural structures.

CHAPTER THREE

THE WAR ECONOMY AND THE ROLES OF GOVERNMENT POLICIES IN TRANSFORMATİON OF THE AGRICULTURAL STRUCTURES OF EDİRNE PROVINCE BETWEEN 1939 AND 1948

The Second World War took place between 1939 and 1945. Since some provinces of Turkey geographically were located in Thrace, the threat was imminent. Hence, Turkey was open to German and USSR attacks until 1941, as was the case of Poland. The Turkish attaché to Germany sent a report about the measures for the protection of national sovereignty and territorial integrity along the north western borders of Turkey on 7 December 1939.[272] He stated that removing the Turks from Thrace had been historical dream for the Germans. The report suggested that Turkey put two armored divisions in Thrace, and establish two weaponry production units, which were deemed essential for supplying munitions and strengthen the air forces.[273] Since Thrace was regarded as under the threat of Hitler from 23 November 1940 to 23 December 1946, martial law was declared in six provinces included Edirne.[274]Thus Çakmak line aimed to defend against enemy in these years.

[272] Osman Yalçın "İkinci Dünya Savaşında İsmet İnönü ve Churchil Arasında Yapılan Adana Görüşmesi," *Ankara Üniversitesi Türk İnkılap Tarihi Enstitüsü Atatürk Yolu Dergisi*, no.47 (2011), p. 724.

[273]Yalçın "İkinci Dünya Savaşında İsmet İnönü ve Churchil Arasında Yapılan Adana Görüşmesi," p. 724.

[274] Allatin Uca "İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yıllarında Türkiye'nin Altı Vilayetinde İlan Edilen Örfi İdare ve Buna Karşı Mecliste Gösterilen Demokratik Tepki" *Atatürk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Dergisi*, no. 40 (2009), p. 377.

After 1941, when Bulgaria joined Hitler and the invasions of Greece, as a border town, Edirne experienced the threat of war seriously. Therefore, the government took some militaristic and economic measures to prepare for a potential war. This influenced the socio-economic life in Edirne.

In Edirne, especially the peasants in the border villages along the Maritsa River experienced this great threat in their social lives. Around Rahmanca and Akçadam villages of Meriç town, many Hungarian and German deserters from Hitler's army took refuge in the frontier villages of Edirne during the invasions of Greece. Many of them were fed up with fighting and hunger. While crossing the frontier, some soldiers could not swim and died in Maritsa River. Some soldiers, who crossed the river, took refuge in Lulu Village (Akçadam) temporarily and put up a tent of the plain of Akçadam. The government offered assistance to these refuges. Therefore, notably the chief of the village, Hüseyin Taşkın, and nearly all of the peasants in Akçadam gave water, bread, and food to these soldiers. Then, these soldiers were dispatched to Uzunköprü in 1942. The peasants who lived in frontier villages were afraid to go to their fields on Maritsa plain. Tighter security measures were taken by the Turkish army around the Maritsa River. [275]

In order to understand the transformation in the agricultural structures in Edirne, the transformation of agricultural structures such as labor force in agriculture, cultivated areas, agricultural production, through government policies such as credit facilities, agricultural cooperatives, transport policy, art and agricultural courses in Edirne between 1939 and 1948 will be examined.

Second, this entire process cannot be thought of independently from the social life of the local peasants. I analyzed the reflections of agricultural investments

[275] Hayri Gezer, Ibrahim Ceylan, Mehmet Dere, Hamit Top, Interview by author, in coffeehouse in Rahmanca Village Edirne, Turkey, 10 July 2013

and economic policies of the RPP government that aimed to meet the staple food needs of cities and army on the socio-economic life of the peasants during the period of WWII which is called as the famine period. The roles of peasants in the agricultural transformation and the severity of war economy will be examined.

To be more analytical and evaluate correctly, we make a comparison the agricultural structures of Edirne with the averages of Turkey. The period between 1939 and 1948 covers both war threat and the last period of the statist economy in Turkey. To be able to understand the developments between 1948 and 1960 in next chapter, the observation of this time period has importance.

Agricultural Structures in Edirne Province between 1939 and 1948

The Population of Edirne during the 1940s

According to population census of 1940, the population of Edirne region was a bit more 250,000. Almost 75 percent of this population was living in rural areas and most of them made up the labor force in the agricultural sector. In 1940, there were 264 villages. The average population of each village was approximately 700 in Edirne Province. There were four counties of Edirne such as Keşan, Uzunköprü, Meriç and İpsala and also eleven townships.[276]

Due to the war threat, population of Edirne declined from 250,000 to 200,000 from 1940 to 1945. The decrease in the population growth was 20 percent. While there was a 5 percent increase in population in the rest of the country.[277] The population growth rate varied in the Edirne region. The danger of the Second World

[276]Republic of Turkey, *General Census (1940),* p. 208.

[277] Republic of Turkey, *Edirne Valiliği,* p. 47.

War was experienced mostly in the villages near the border between Turkey and Bulgaria, such as Hamzabeyli, Kalkansöğüt, and Suakacağı. In the same way, the population of Edirne, Sarayakpınar Nahiyesi (Sırpsındığı township) and Lalapaşa township decreased almost by half. When the population of 1940 and that of 1950 are compared, after the threat of Second World War, the people returned and the central district Edirne increased by almost 30,000 with the returners.[278]

Similarly, according to the guide book written by the Edirne Chamber of Industry and Commerce, the older people said in their narratives that the population of central district of Edirne had declined almost to 10,000.[279] According to the explanations of Edirne Governorship in 1941, citizens who wanted to leave were required to inform by police stations in Edirne.[280] Similarly, the newspapers in İstanbul and in Thrace called for the migrations of elderly, retirees, widows in Edirne and those who had relatives in Anatolia[281](except İstanbul, Ankara, İzmir and Erzurum).[282] On the other hand, the war threat did not influence the population of Keşan who lived around 100 km away from the Bulgarian borders. Furthermore, their population increased almost ten percent markedly during the war period.

Physical Land Structure of Edirne in the 1940s

After population, who was employed in the agricultural sector, and the size of cultivable lands was important. The Questionnaire of Landed and Landless Peasants

[278] Republic of Turkey, *Edirne Ticaret ve Sanayi Odası Rehberi,* p. 63

[279] Ibid., p. 63.

[280] "Gitmek İçin Hiçbir Mecburiyet Yoktur Yalnız Arzuya Bağlıdır," *Edirne Postası*, 21 April 1941.

[281] Bülent Bakar "İkinci Dünya Savaşında Trakya dan Anadolu'ya Göç ve Paniğe Karşı Propoganda" *Yakın Dönem Türkiye Araştırmaları Dergisi,* no.12 (2007), p.5

[282] *Edirne Postası*, 21 April 1941

in 1939, conducted by the offices of finance, agriculture, foundation and title deed in the Thrace Public Inspectorships in Edirne was examined. The provinces included in the provinces of Thrace Public Inspectorships were Edirne, Kırklareli, Tekirdağ and Çanakkale. The Questionnaire indicated physical lands structure of Thrace. [283]

This survey was based on the statements of local farmers. Before conducting a survey about physical land of Thrace, Thrace Public Inspectorships informed the village clerks and board of alderman through the district governors. The schedule was prepared by the General Directorates of Statistics to be distributed to the villages to be filled out. This questionnaire was conducted in 1310 villages in Thrace. [284]

The geographical area of the Thrace Public Inspectorships was almost 29,000,000 dönüms. However, only half of this land was cultivable.[285] Moreover, the size of the existing cultivated lands was around 7,000,000 dönüms. [286]Although on the average 53 percent of cultivable lands in the Thrace Public Inspectorships could be cultivated, it showed changes based on the land structure of every province. For example, it was almost 55 percent in Edirne, almost 80 percent in Kırklareli, 35 percent in Çanakkale, 55 percent in Tekirdağ. On average, 15,000 dönüms lands fall to each village. In the light of these data, almost 54 percent of the land was cultivated by means of human labor. As for agricultural activities, there were field agriculture, vineyards and orchards.[287]

[283]Republic of Turkey, *Trakya Umumi Müfettişlik Bölgesinde yapılan Toprak Anketi (1939)* (Ankara: Prime Ministry, 1939), p. 4

[284] Ibid., p. 4.

[285] Ibid., p. 5.

[286] Ibid., p. 6.

[287] Ibid., p. 7.

There were around 116,000 rural families throughout Thrace.[288] Almost 100,000 of these families were landowners. This number corresponded to nearly 85 percent.[289] Almost 10,000 rural families had a piece of small land. This number corresponded to almost 10 percent. The rest of the 5500 rural families were landless peasants. [290] In terms of cultivation; the proportion of sharecroppers was almost 10 percent.[291] Furthermore, on average, between 60 dönüms and 70 dönüms land fall to each rural family.[292]

In particular to Edirne, there were 4,000,000 dönüms cultivable land[293]and nearly 24,000 peasant families cultivated their own lands in 1939.[294] They cultivated around 1,700,000 dönüms land. Besides, nearly 1800 families out of 24,000 had a piece of farm lands. They cultivated almost 80,000 dönüms. Similar to the average of Thrace, the peasant who had a piece of land cultivated 30 dönüms in Edirne province. On the average, there were 5 people in each peasant family.[295] This statistical data indicate that 95 percent of peasants cultivated their own lands in Edirne, while 5 percent of peasants were landless.[296] On the other hand, after the Çanakkale region, Edirne was in the second place in proportion of landless peasant, with almost 1300 families.[297]On average, there were six landless families in every village. These landless peasants earned their livelihood through sharecropping and

[288] Ibid.,p.11

[289] Ömer Celal Sarç, *Türkiye Ekonomisinin Genel Esasları,*1st edition (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1944), p. 294.

[290]Republic of Turkey, *Trakya Umumi Müfettişlik Bölgesinde yapılan Toprak Anketi (1939)*, p. 11

[291] Ömer Celal Sarç, *Türkiye Ekonomisinin Genel Esasları,* p. 313.

[292]Republic of Turkey, *Trakya Umumi Müfettişlik Bölgesinde yapılan Toprak Anketi (1939)*, p. 11

[293] Ibid., p. 7.

[294] Ibid., p. 12.

[295] Ibid., p. 11

[296] Ibid., p. 12

[297] Ibid., p. 13

land tenure. Some of these landless peasants were engaged in husbandry, shepherding, and village guard.[298]

In 1939, in the villages of Edirne, the average amount of village land was nearly 15,000 dönüms.[299]However, only half of this land could be cultivated by the peasants. [300] With the outbreak of the Second World War, the RPP government declared a state of emergency in Thrace. Similarly, the government took some economic and militaristic measures at the national level. Therefore not only many young males were conscripted into army but also draught animals were confiscated by the state within the scope of the National Protection Law in 1940. On average, each peasant family had two pairs of draught animals in 1939.[301] For example while there were 140,000 draught animals such as oxen, water buffalo, horse and cattle in 1938, their numbers decreased to around 100,000 during the Second World War in Edirne.[302]

This led to a decline in the means of production. The peasants began to cultivate their lands through sharecropping. These factors not only limited the size of cultivated lands, but also led to sharecropping more and more in agricultural sector. For example, almost 400 out of 22,000 rural families were partly involved in sharecropping. Similarly, nearly 600 out of 22,000 rural families were completely involved in sharecropping.[303]Almost 30,000 dönüms out of 1,700,000 dönüms of these lands in 1939,[304] was cultivated through sharecropping. Each sharecropping

[298] Ibid., p. 14

[299] İbid., p. 5

[300] Ibid., p. 10

[301] Ibid., p. 6.

[302] Republic of Turkey, *Annual Statistics (1948)* (Ankara: Prime Ministry, 1948), p. 311.

[303]Republic of Turkey, *Trakya Umumi Müfettişlik Bölgesinde yapılan Toprak Anketi (1939)*, p. 12

[304] Ibid., p. 13.

family cultivated nearly 30 dönüms.[305] By the same token, the cultivation area of viticulture was almost 50,000 but almost half of this was cultivated by sharecroppers.[306] Vine cultivation was so widespread in Edirne that almost 80 percent villages of Edirne were engaging in vine cultivation.[307] The annual grape production was 1200 tons between 1938 and 1942.[308] During 1940s, almost one million American types of vine stems were distributed across Thrace.[309] Almost half of this production was from the villages of Keşan.[310] On the average, each peasant family had 15 dönüms vineyards.[311]In the cultivation of agricultural lands, there were 34 tractors and almost 22000 agricultural machines such as various kinds of plough and harrow in Edirne in 1940.[312] On the other hand, there were 1066 tractors in Turkey,[313] at the utmost 20 tractors were falling to each province in Turkey.

Apart from cultivated lands, based upon the agricultural survey of the Thrace Public Inspectorships in 1939, Edirne had almost 1,000,000 dönüms of pastureland, almost 210,000 dönüms of forests, about 100,000 dönüms of swamplands, almost 50,000 decars of meadow and more than 30,000 decars of lake.[314] By opening a 130 km water channel, almost 40,000 dönüms of swampland were drained and transformed into agricultural lands between 1939 and 1946.[315]

---

[305] Ibid., p. 14.

[306] Ibid., pp. 10-13.

[307] Ibid., p. 7.

[308] Republic of Turkey, *Annual Statistics (1948),* p. 300.

[309] "Trakya'da Bağcılık," *Edirne Postası*, 22 March 1939.

[310] Republic of Turkey, *Annual Statistics (1948),* p. 300.

[311]Republic of Turkey, *Trakya Umumi Müfettişlik Bölgesinde yapılan Toprak Anketi (1939),* p. 10

[312] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Equipments and Machinery Statistics (1940)* (İstanbul: Hüsnütabiat Basımevi, 1941), p. 11.

[313] Republic of Turkey, *The Summary of Agricultural Statistics (1939-1959),* p. 1.

[314] Republic of Turkey, *Trakya Umumi Müfettişlik Bölgesinde yapılan Toprak Anketi (1939),* p. 7

[315] Republic of Turkey, *Annual Statistics (1948)* p.191

On the average, since almost one- third of village lands were grasslands,[316] animal husbandry was another important economic activity in Edirne. In 1939, there were around 450,000 sheep and goats and 130,000 cattle.[317]However with the development of arboriculture in Edirne, peasants sold many of their goats and bought sheep.[318] With the extent of pastureland, grassland, swampland, vine cultivation and meadows, Edirne had the biggest size of lands within the borders of the Thrace Public Administration. These lands had importance for the development of animal husbandry in Edirne. In addition to meat and milk, peasants used manure in their fields as fertilizer to increase agricultural productivity. Furthermore, animal husbandry and cereal cultivation support each other reciprocally. Since there was mechanization, draught animals were used to cultivate lands. Also in the growth of cereals, animal manures were being used. In return, cereals such as barley, rye and oat were used as forage to feed animals.[319]

However, the threat of Second World War not only unsettled agricultural production but also animal husbandry For example, while the number of animals was nearly 600,000 in 1939, it decreased to 350,000 in 1944.[320] The number of animals could reach 660,000 in post war period. Almost 60 percent of these animals were sheep and goats. Similarly, 25 percent was cattle. Also the rest was pack animals such as horses and donkeys. [321] Furthermore, in the third agricultural region where

[316] Republic of Turkey, *Trakya Umumi Müfettişlik Bölgesinde yapılan Toprak Anketi (1939)*, p. 8

[317] Ibid., p. 6.

[318] "Trakyamızda Zirai Kalkınma," *Edirne Postası*, 22 February 1939.

[319] Fernand Braudel, *The Structures of Everday Life Civilization and Capitalism 15th and 18th,* (London :Collins**,** 1981), p. 121.

[320] Republic of Turkey, *Annual Statistics (1948)* p. 311

[321] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1946-1954)* (Ankara: Prime Ministry, 1955), p. 73.

the state of emergency was declared, the number of animals decreased markedly in relation with other eight agricultural regions.[322]

Secondly, for meadowlands, the proportion of meadowland to agricultural fields was almost 1 percent across Thrace. In İpsala town in Edirne with four rates, it was over the mean of Thrace.[323] Across Thrace, providing that whole land that was cultivated by labor force is compared to general population, it might be seen that 100 decars corresponded to almost nine people.[324]

Ranges of Agricultural Products and Their Cultivation Areas in the 1940s

Through the increase in cultivated land and the encouragement of state in agricultural sector in the 1930s, Turkish agriculture developed in terms of production, productivity and the range of products. For example the size of cultivated land increased almost 750,000 dönüms and agricultural production increased 60,000 tons, and reached almost 200,000 tons from 1937 to 1939.[325] However, this situation grew worsen in Edirne during WW II periods.

The cultivation area and agricultural production of cereals, industrial crops and legumes between 1939 and 1942 showed serious changes in Edirne. For example, while the cultivation area of cereals was almost 1,700,000 dönüms in 1939, it decreased to around 700,000 dönüms in 1942.[326] The cultivation area and the production of these crops started to decrease on the average in Turkey markedly after

[322] Republic of Turkey, *Annual Statistics (1948),* pp. 306-315

[323]Republic of Turkey, Trakya Umumi Müfettişlik Bölgesinde yapılan Toprak Anketi (1939), p. 8

[324] Ibid., p. 11.

[325] Republic of Turkey, *Field Crops Statistics (1937-1939*) (Ankara: Recep Ulusoğlu Basımevi, 1940), p. 102.

[326] Republic of Turkey, *Field Crops Statistics (1940-1945)* (Ankara: Prime Ministry, 1947), pp 2-59.

1942. The main reasons of this clear cut decline in agriculture may have been the conscription able male population into military and the confiscation of draught animals. Rather than the increasing amount of new agricultural lands, peasants tried to cultivate the existing lands during war. When compared with many Anatolian cities, in Edirne, not only agricultural products declined but also the cultivated lands decreased remarkably during this period. The cultivation areas of agricultural products were around 800,000 dönüms and annual production was around 100,000 tons during war period.[327] Peasants could reach the cultivation areas and agricultural production of 1939, in 1948.

Cereal Cultivation

Similar to the average of Turkey, almost 90 percent of cultivated lands were cereal in the province of Edirne. Cereals were staple foods and required less labor force in comparison with industrial crop. Since cereals could be stored for a long time, they were preferred during the war years. The cultivation area of cereal decreased half in half in Edirne, from 1,300,000 dönüms in 1939, to 650,000 dönüms in 1942. Similarly, the output of cereal decreased from 200,000 tons to 60,000 tons from 1939 to 1942.[328]

In addition to the conscription of able men and the confiscation of draught animals in Edirne in which there was state of emergency, -15^{o}C in winter months[329] and the flood of the Maritsa River in the winter 1940-41 influenced the decline of agricultural production. This was the biggest flood since 1872. Almost 400,000

[327] Ibid., pp. 2-59.

[328] Ibid., pp. 2-59.

[329] Republic of Turkey, *Annual Statistics (1948),* pp. 32-33.

dönüms of agricultural land flooded in Edirne and similarly 420,000 dönüms submerged in Evros in Greece.[330] Similarly, another flood of Maritsa became in 1947 and Maritsa plain was exposed to flood from Edirne to Enez.[331] Between 1943 and 1945, the cultivation area of cereal was around 800,000 and the agricultural production was around 70,000 tons. In post war period, the cultivation area and the production of cereal reached to the level of 1939. Almost half of the cereal production was from the villages of central district Edirne.

First, similar to the average of Turkey, in terms of the cultivation area and the production, wheat was placed at the top in Edirne during the war period. The sudden decline in the production of wheat indicates the negative impact of WWII on the socio-economic life in Edirne remarkably in1939. While the cultivation area of wheat was nearly 650,000 dönüms in 1939,[332] it decreased by almost a third in 1943. Similarly, the production of wheat decreased from 70,000 tons to around 15,000 tons.[333] On the other hand, wheat production began to decline after 1942 in the average of Turkey.[334] The production of wheat remained around 30,000 tons and its cultivation area was around 300,000 dönüms in Edirne until 1948.[335]

Wheat is a winter cereal with a growth cycle of almost nine months from October to June. Since wheat is a high nutritional value food and mainly consumed by people, its cultivation area and production are the highest of cereals. However, the during war period, the cereal cultivation decreased. First, due to the decreasing labor force and winter conditions, the production of wheat was low in Edirne at the

[330] Serkan Genç "Edirne Tunca Bölgesinde Sürdürülebilir Yerleşmenin Yeniden Biçimlendirilmesi" (MA Thesis, Trakya University, 2006), p. 50.

[331] "Edirne Su Baskınına Uğradı," *Edirne Postası*, 27 January 1947.

[332] Republic of Turkey, *Field Crops Statistics (1937-1939),* p. 21

[333] Republic of Turkey, *Field Crops Statistics (1940-1945),* p. 2.

[334]Republic of Turkey, *The Summary of Agricultural Statistics (1939-1959),* p. 4.

[335] Republic of Turkey, *Annual Statistics (1948),* p. 256.

beginning of 1940s. Second, with the decreasing number of animals, from 530,000 to 430,000, peasants used less fertilizer in their wheat and thus agricultural productivity declined.[336] Third, as was mentioned before, since the able male population was conscripted to army and with the confiscation of draught animals, labor productivity decreased in the villages. Furthermore, peasants cultivated some of their lands by sharecropping. The elderly and women had difficulty in harvesting.

So as to strengthen the national defense and to meet the food needs of the cities and military, the RPP government legislated the National Protection Law policy in 1940. However, since government aimed to buy the agricultural products of the peasant at reduced prices, peasants began to store and hide their crops from the state control. For example, when wheat prices are analyzed during war period in Edirne, except for 1942, they were around 30 kuruş per kilogram. Therefore, they were close to the national average wheat price.[337] The main reasons for the increase in wheat price (70 kuruş per one kilogram) in 1942 were the increasing demand for wheat in these years, climate conditions, and the decreasing wheat cultivation in Edirne. Since there was no developed transportation network in the country, the government could not collect cereals or provide price unity in cereals at the national level.

Barley was important source of forage for horses. If there was no barley harvest, food needs of war could not be provided.[338] Similar to wheat, barley is a winter crop but its growth cycle was seven months. In contrast to the average of Turkey, barley was the third in cereals that was cultivated after wheat and corn in the province of Edirne. However, while barley cultivation was almost half of that of

[336] Ibid., p. 311.

[337] Ibid., p. 282.

[338] Fernand Braudel, *The Structures of Everday Life Civilization and Capitalism,* p.110

wheat on the average of nation, it was nearly one third of wheat in Edirne. For example, the cultivation area of barley decreased from 170,000 dönüms to around 80,000dönüms from 1939 to 1943. Similarly, barley production decreased from 17,000 tons to nearly 6,000 tons in 1943 in Edirne. Although barley cultivation increased a far amount until 1945, it could reach to the level of 1939 in post war period.[339]

Due to war threat and decreasing production, similar to wheat, the price of barley was higher. It was 40 kuruş per one kilogram in Edirne in 1942. Therefore, it was two times higher than the average of Turkey. On the other hand, barley prices were nearly 15 kuruş in Edirne during the war period. These prices were as much as half of the average of Turkey. [340]

In contrast to the average of Turkey, the cultivation areas of barley and rye were very close to each other in Edirne during the war. From 1941 onwards the cultivation area of rye was much greater than that of barley.[341] This does not mean the increase in the cultivation area of rye. Both rye and barley cultivation decreased, but while the cultivation area of barley decreased 80,000 dönüms, the cultivation area of rye decreased around 50,000 dönüms during war period. The annual cultivation area of rye was around 90,000 dönüms and annual rye production was around 5,000 tons until 1944. Barley production could reach the levels of 1939 in the post war period.[342] The price of rice was 55 kuruş per kilogram in 1942. Similarly, since rice was high nutritional value food and during war period, there were high demands for rice. Thus Edirne had the most expensive rye prices in 1942. On the

[339]Republic of Turkey, *Field Crops Statistics (1940-1945),* p. 4.

[340] Republic of Turkey, *Annual Statistics (1948),* p. 283.

[341] Republic of Turkey, *Field Crops Statistics (1940-1945),* p.4.

[342] Ibid., pp.4-8.

other hand rye price per one kilogram was by almost a third in the average of Turkey in 1942. But then rye prices per one kilogram were around 20 kuruş and they were around the average of Turkey during war period. [343]

Peasants determined their cereal choice pragmatically and they tried to avoid from food scarcity. First rye was a more suitable cereal crop for the continental climate of Thrace. Because the growth process of rye was seven month, it could be harvested earlier than wheat. Most importantly, the enlargement in the cultivation of rye could be explained with the functions of rye during war condition. While wheat was consumed by people and barley was used to feed animals mostly, rye could be consumed by both. Rye bread was less nutritional than wheat bread, but much more nutritional than barley bread.[344]

Corn had the second largest crop after wheat in Edirne during war period. Its cultivation area was around 170,000 dönüms and its production was nearly 20,000 tons between 1939 and 1942.[345] In this time period, due to starvation and poverty, there was corn smuggling between the villages of Turkey and Greece where situated along Maritsa River. Nearly half of the maize production was from the villages of Uzunköprü.[346] Through the cultivation of maize, crop rotation could be provided more easily. Similarly, it had at least two times larger cultivation area than barley and rye in 1943. In contrast to the average of Turkey, for the first time, the cultivation area of corn was higher than that of wheat in 1943 in Edirne. For example while nearly the cultivation area of wheat was 220,000 dönüms and annual wheat production was almost 15,000 ton in 1943, the cultivation area of corn was 230,000

[343] Republic of Turkey, *Annual Statistics (1948),* p. 286.

[344] Braudel, p. 110.

[345]Republic of Turkey, *Field Crops Statistics (1940-1945),* pp. 14-15.

[346] Republic of Turkey, *Field Crops Statistics (1937-1939),* pp. 73-81.

dönüms and annual corn production was 22,000 tons in the same year.[347] The peasants preferred to grow corn to rye or barley cultivation. The planted area of maize was around 180,000 dönüms until 1946.[348] The prices of maize per kilogram, was around 20 kuruş and close to the average of Turkey between 1944 and 1946.[349]

In order to understand the increasing production of maize, its functions need to be analyzed. Corn is a miraculous plant, it grows quickly and its grain is edible even before its ripe.[350] Corn was summer crop and can be grown in three or four months. Thus, some peasants also were sowing corn their fields after the wheat harvest. Corn had higher productivity than other cereals. Thanks to its husk, it was more durable against bird infestation.

Many peasants were occupied with corn agriculture to supply their food needs more easily and guarantee their socio-economic life. Apart from weeding and irrigation, corn did not require a labor force. Similarly, in contrast to other cereals such as wheat, rye, and barley, its harvest was easier. Even small children and elderly could work in corn harvest while they had difficulty reaping wheat, rye or barley with scythes. Therefore, corn was more preferred plant during war period when there was labor scarcity and no mechanization. Also corn could be ground in hand mills more easily. Similar to rye, it could be consumed by people and animals. Similar to other cereals, it could be kept in storehouse for a long time.

Since the *selektör* (seed cleaning and dressing machines) was high duty machines, they became influential in the increase of agricultural productivity. There were almost 260 seed cleaning machines in Turkey. Thus, on the average, three seed

[347]Republic of Turkey, *Field Crops Statistics (1940-1945),* pp. 2-15.

[348] Ibid., p. 14.

[349] Republic of Turkey, *Annual Statistics (1948),* p. 284.

[350] Braudel, p. 161.

cleaning machines appeared in every province. [351] In order to encourage cereal cultivation, to increase the amount of cleaned seeds and to get higher productivity in Edirne, the Agricultural Ministry sent eight more selectors to Edirne in 1940. By the same token, these selectors were used to clean and disinfect agricultural seeds such as wheat, rye, barley and so on before planting in the fields in 1939. [352] Five threshing machines were sent to Thrace in 1941.[353]

These seed cleaning machines cleaned almost 2200 ton seed in Edirne. There was such high demand among farmers that these machines were working in the evenings and almost none of the peasants wanted to sow their seeds without cleaning in Edirne. These eight seed cleaning machines were settled in prominent towns of Edirne such as central district of Edirne, Uzunköprü, and Keşan. For example three seed cleaning machines in Edirne cleaned almost one 1000 tons of seed, the two seed cleaning machines in Uzunköprü cleaned almost 700 tons of seed, and also one seed cleaning machine in Keşan cleaned around 100 tons of seed. 150,000 dönüms out of 1,300,000 dönüms of cereals were sown with these cleaned seed in Edirne in 1939.[354]

Due to serious drought in 1945, agricultural production declined both in Edirne and across Turkey. In order to support agricultural development, the Agricultural Ministry sent sufficient amounts of wheat, beet, and alfalfa seeds notably to Sırpsındığı (Sarayakpınar) township and the villages of Lalapaşa. Similarly, in order to test agricultural productivity, the Agricultural Ministry also sent chemical manure to districts of Edirne in 1945.[355] Similarly, the government

[351] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Equipments and Machinery Statistics (1940),* p. 8.

[352] "Sekiz Yeni Selektör Getiriliyor,"*Edirne Postası,* 18 January 1939.

[353] "Hükümet Hasada Başlamak Üzere Tedbirler Aldı," *Edirne Postası,* 14 June 1941.

[354] "Trakyamızda Açılan Selektör İstasyonları Çiftçmize Faydalı Oluyor," *Edirne Postası,* 4 April 1939.

[355]"Trakya'da Ekim ve Hayvancılık İşleri," *Edirne Postası,* 3 October 1945.

sent 1450 tons of wheat seed to farmers who suffered from natural disasters such as frost, flood, and other winter conditions. The Agricultural Bank provided credit facilities in1947.[356]

Legumes Cultivation

Similar to cereal crops, the cultivation area and the production of legumes showed fluctuations during war period. While the cultivation area of legume started to decline at the rate of twenty percent after 1942 across Turkey,[357] it declined at the rate of thirty five percent after 1939 in Edirne.[358] For example the cultivation area of legumes was around 25,000 dönüms and the production of legumes was nearly 4000 ton in 1939.[359] The annual cultivation area of legumes was around 16,000 dönüms and annual production was around one thousand tons in Edirne until 1945. Namely, similar to cereals, there was remarkable decline in agricultural productivity in legumes. Similar to the average of Turkey, the cultivation area of legume and its production could increase after 1946. For example the cultivation area of legume increased to 40,000 dönüms and annual production was around 3,000 ton in 1946.[360]

Similar to the average of Turkey, bitter vetch, bean and chickpea had the largest cultivation area and production rate in Edirne during the 1940s. While the cultivation area of these prominent legumes constituted eighty percent in total the legume cultivation in Edirne, the cultivation area of bitter vetch, bean and chick pea

[356] "Çiftçiye Tohumluk," *Edirne Postası* 12 November 1947.

[357] Republic of Turkey, *The Summary of Agricultural Statistics (1939-1959),* p. 5.

[358]Republic of Turkey, *Field Crops Statistics (1940-1945),* pp. 26-37.

[359] Republic of Turkey, *Field Crops Statistics (1937-1939),* pp. 109-180.

[360] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1946-1954),* p. 72.

constituted only half of the legumes in the average of Turkey.[361] Due to the climate conditions and the preferences of the peasants, the ranges of legumes were lower in Edirne. For example the cultivation area of lentil, common vetch, and broad bean was quite low.

Chick pea and bean were cheap sources of protein and they were supplementary cereals during the war period.[362] Since their growth process was four month, legumes were preferred. The prices of legumes were almost the same as wheat. Furthermore, bean and chickpea prices were higher than wheat in Turkey during the 1940s. For example, similar to the average of Turkey, the prices of bean and chickpea were around 40-45 kuruş per one kilogram in Edirne during war period.[363]

While bitter vetch had the largest cultivation area[364] and production in the average of Turkey, it was bean in Edirne in the 1940s. Furthermore, almost half of the legume production was bean in Edirne. For example, the annual bean production in average was 500 ton between 1939 and 1945.[365] This increased to almost 1200 tons after 1946.[366] Similar to the average of Turkey, almost one quarter of legume cultivation area was bitter vetch in Edirne during the 1940s. Since bitter vetch required less labor force in its cultivation, it could grow in the continental climate and it was one of the most important feed crops, its cultivation area and production were higher.

---

[361] Republic of Turkey, *The Summary of Agricultural Statistics (1939-1959)*, p. 5.

[362] Braudel, p. 113.

[363] Republic of Turkey, *Annual Statistics (1948)*, pp. 284-288.

[364] Republic of Turkey, *Field Crops Statistics (1937-1939)*, pp. 73-81.

[365] Republic of Turkey, *Field Crops Statistics (1940-1945)*, pp. 26-37.

[366] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1946-1954)*, p. 72.

The Cultivation of Industrial Crops

The cultivation area and the production of industrial crops decreased during the war period. Cereals that required less human labor and had high nutritional value were preferred in the 1940s. For example, when I analyzed the statistical data, the cultivation area of industrial crops was 200,000 dönüms and their production was over 80,000 tons in 1939.[367] When it comes to 1942, the cultivation area of industrial crops decreased to 60,000 dönüms and the production was 55,000 ton. On the average, the cultivation area of these products was about 80,000 dönüms and average production was 60,000 tons until 1945. In contrast to the 20 percent decline in the average of Turkey, there was an almost one third decline in the cultivation areas of industrial crops in Edirne during the war period.[368] Similar to the production of industrial crops in Turkey, the cultivation area of industrial crops reached that of 1939 in Edirne between 1946 and 1950. [369]

Across Turkey, cotton, tobacco, potato, sesame, and sugar beet were among the leading industrial crops. Their cultivation area constituted almost 85 percent of industrial crops. No doubt, cotton had the largest cultivation area during the 1940s.[370] In general, even though the cultivation area of industrial crops started to decline in 1943, their cultivation area only increased after 1948 again.

In Edirne, while sugar beet, sesame and linen were the leading products during war period, cotton cultivation and tobacco were under the average of Turkey. The cultivation area and the production of sesame decreased steadily from 1939 to

[367] Republic of Turkey, *Field Crops Statistics (1937-1939),* pp. 181-270.

[368] Republic of Turkey, *Field Crops Statistics (1940-1945),* pp. 37-59.

[369] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1946-1954),* p.72

[370] Republic of Turkey, *The Summary of Agricultural Statistics (1939-1959),* p.6

1948.[371] For example, the production of sesame decreased from 5300 tons to 2100 tons in this time period. While the cultivation area of sesame was almost 130,000 dönüms in 1939, it decreased half in half by 1941. Similarly, in 1945, the cultivation area of sesame was around 10,000 dönüms and annual sesame production was 180 tons.[372] Similar to the average of Turkey, the cultivation area of sesame reached 50,000 dönüms and annual sesame production increased to nearly 3,000 tons between 1946 and 1950.[373] At least 60 percent of this sesame was produced in the villages of İpsala and Keşan.[374]

Although sesame can grown in four months (between April and July) and it can provide crop rotation, the cultivation of sesame decreased in Edirne and across Turkey. Since sesame required a labor force especially during the harvest, many peasants did not prefer sesame cultivation. Furthermore, when the harvest time was delayed, sesame production decreased. Similar to the average of Turkey, due to insufficient fertilizer and irrigation, agricultural productivity of sesame was only 50 kilogram per dönüm in Edirne. [375]

The cultivation of sugar beet could increase in the average of Turkey and in Edirne during the 1940s.[376] For example except 1942, the cultivation area of sugar beet was 60,000 dönüms and annual production was 50,000 ton during the 1940s.[377] Due to climate conditions and war threat, there was a general decline in cultivation area and production of almost all products in 1942. The production of sugar beet

[371] Republic of Turkey, *Field Crops Statistics (1940-1945),* pp. 37-59.

[372] Ibid., p. 58.

[373] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1946-1954),* p. 72.

[374] Republic of Turkey, *Field Crops Statistics (1937-1939),* p. 264.

[375] Republic of Turkey, *The Summary of Agricultural Statistics (1939-1959),* p. 7.

[376] Ibid., p. 7.

[377]Republic of Turkey, *Field Crops Statistics (1940-1945),* pp. 37-59.

[377] Ibid., p. 42.

decreased 50 percent in 1942. Even though sugar beet required a labor force, its cultivation and production did not decrease as much as sesame. Since sugar was highly consumed, there was a high demand. All of the sugar beet cultivation was done in the villages of Uzunköprü, Meriç, and Edirne which were situated near the railway that had connections with Alpullu Sugar Plant.

All of the farmers in the villages of Meriç and Uzunköprü brought their sugar beets with their oxcarts to the Çakmak village of Uzunköprü. Sugar beets was weighed and loaded on wagons to be sent to the Alpullu Sugar Plant. However, since one- third of the draught animals had been confiscated by the army, many peasants had difficulty transporting their sugar beet to Çakmak village. Some of the sugar beets were used to make molasses and forage. Sugar production in the Alpullu Sugar Beet also verified this fact. For example, around 170,000 tons of sugar beet was produced across Thrace in 1939. Almost 168,000 tons of sugar beet was used to get sugar and around 25,000 tons sugar was obtained. On the other hand, 90,000 tons sugar beet was grown across Thrace in 1942 and by almost a third could be transported to Alpullu Sugar Plant and therefore only 8,000 tons sugar could be produced. [378]

Since there was sufficient raining, the production amount of sugar beets was good in 1944. After the Alpullu Sugar Beet Plant started campaign, the beet lifting and its transportation were started.[379] The transportation of this sugar beets product was realized by means of railways. Thus, in order to prevent farmers from unnecessary waiting, official took essential measures. For example the Turkish State Railways allocated sufficient numbers of wagon on time in 1944.[380] Thus with the

[378] Republic of Turkey, *Annual Statistics (1948),* p. 333.

[379] "Pancar Sökümü Başladı," *Edirne Postası,* 31 May 1944.

[380] *Edirne Postası,* 01 June1944.

supply of sugar, the prices of sugar became cheap. According to prescript of government, granulated sugar was 180 kuruş and cube sugar was 200 kuruş. However, one kilogram sugar beet was 30-35 kuruş.[381] In the sale of sugar beet, the Alpullu Sugar Plants was interested. Based upon the length of villages from plants, agriculturalists made lifted sugar beets.[382] The Alpullu Sugar Plant gave beet pulp to farmers who delivered their sugar beet.[383]These beet pulps were used as forage.

In 1939 the cultivation area of linen was around 6000 dönüms and annual production was nearly 250 ton in Edirne. Linen was grown mostly in the villages of Keşan.[384] After a report about linen cultivation in 1939, some amount of linen seeds were sent to Edirne by the Çanakkale and Kocaeli Agricultural Directorates.[385] Furthermore, Agricultural Ministry planned to open a new course regarding linen cultivation to peasants in the same year. However, the cultivation area of linen was not more than 1500 dönüms during the 1940s.[386]

While cotton had the largest cultivation area in industrial crops on the average of Turkey during the 1940s, it did not have the largest cultivation area in Edirne. In general cotton cultivation was done in the villages of Edirne and Keşan. While the cultivation area of cotton was 2600 dönüms and its annual production were almost 40 tons in 1939,[387] its cultivation area and annual production had decreased ten times in 1945.[388]

---

[381] "Trakya da Ziraat Bu Sene Çok Bereketli," *Edirne Postası*, 14 June 1946.

[382] *Edirne Postası*, 10 October 1942.

[383] *Edirne Postası*, 31 Mayıs 1942.

[384] Republic of Turkey, *Field Crops Statistics (1937-1939),* p. 237.

[385] "Trakyamızın Zirai Durumunda Yeni ve Büyük Bir İnkışaf Var,"*Edirne Postası*, 14 March 1939

[386] Republic of Turkey, *Field Crops Statistics (1940-1945),* p. 52.

[387] Republic of Turkey, *Field Crops Statistics (1937-1939),* p. 228.

[388] Republic of Turkey, *Field Crops Statistics (1940-1945),* p. 50.

In cotton cultivation, the native species of cotton was stopped. Instead of this, the *akala* type (an American species) which it had a high yield, and thin durable fibre was substituted. In this way, cotton cultivation was regulated. In this sense, new species of cotton and cotton gin were sent by the Agricultural Ministry to the villages of Keşan and İpsala town. [389] Similarly, in 1940, to develop cotton agriculture, the Agricultural Ministry sent 13,000 kilograms of cotton seed to farmers in Edirne and Tekirdağ.[390] However, due to insufficient fertilizer and irrigation, the agricultural productivity of cotton in Edirne was under the average of Turkey.

Rice cultivation could be done thanks to Maritsa and Ergene plains. In 1939 the cultivation area of rice was almost 8500 dönüms and annual rice production was 2150 tons.[391] Also the cultivation area of rice was between 10,000dönüms and 20,000 dönüms during the war period. Although the annual rice production changed, it was between 3,000 and 4,000 tons.[392] After 1946, it increased to 20,000 tons. Peasants in the villages of İpsala engaged in rice agriculture in fertile lands of Maritsa plain from 1933 onwards. Half of the rice cultivation in Edirne was done in the villages of İpsala. Rice cultivation in İpsala was increasing year by year. For example while the annual rice production was around 1400 ton in 1939, it increased to 10,000 tons in 1948 in İpsala.[393]

However, some factors prevented the peasants from doing rice agriculture. First, since rice cultivation required labor force in the cultivation and harvest, its cultivation area remained limited during the war period. For example, since there were no pesticides, people pulled out weeds in paddy fields. Similarly, since combine

[389] *Edirne Postası*, 14 March, 1939.

[390] "Keşan ve Havalisinde Zirai Vaziyet İyidir," *Edirne Postası*, 4 June 1940.

[391] Republic of Turkey, *Field Crops Statistics (1937-1939),* p. 93.

[392] Republic of Turkey, *Field Crops Statistics (1940-1945),* p. 18.

[393] "Türkiye'de Çeltik İstihsali ve İpsala," *Vatandaş Gazetesi*, 28 September 1948.

harvester could not enter the paddy fields, the peasants harvested the rice by hand. Second, in general, since these fields were very close to the Maritsa River which determines the border between Turkey and Greece, many peasants were afraid to go their fields in Maritsa plain during the war period. Third, since the paddy fields were wetlands and to some extent swamplands, these areas were suitable for the reproduction of mosquitoes that caused malaria. In order to eradicate malaria, sanitary authorities and village administrations collaborated during the 1940s.[394]Waterholes and swamplands that formed after the floods of the Maritsa River in 1940-41 caused the appearance of malaria. Struggle Organizations against malaria were formed and medical personnel went to treat patients.[395]Malaria not only limited rice cultivation, but also decreased the labor force.

As Cultural and Economic Activity: Silkworm Breeding

Although it showed a falling tendency by almost a third in the number of families who bred silkworms and the production of silkworm from 1933 to 1939, it was one of the most important economic activities in the Edirne region. In these years, almost 2000 peasants were engaged in silkworm breeding and they obtained almost 170,000 tons of cocoon.[396] In Edirne Region, there were almost 450,000 mulberry trees. There were 250,000 mulberry trees in the villages of Edirne, 180,000 mulberry trees in the villages of Meriç town. Mulberry growing and silkworm breeding were more common in the villages that had larger plains. Just as some mulberry trees were in their gardens near their house, some tress were in mulberry

[394] "Sıtma Kaynaklarının Kökü Kurulmak Üzere Sağlık ve Köy İdareleri İşbirliği Yapacak," *Edirne Postası*, 2 April 1941.

[395]"Trakya'da Sıtma Mücdelesi," *Edirne Postası*, 16 June 1941.

[396]Republic of Turkey, *Trakya Umumi Müfettişlik Bölgesinde yapılan Toprak Anketi (1939)*, p. 129

gardens in the Maritsa Plain. For example, in Küplü, Lulu (Akçadam), Naushbey, Ede (Kadıdondurma) and Hasırcıarnavut villages of Meriç town, there were 100,000 mulberry trees and 20,000 kilograms of cocoon was produced.[397] Furthermore, silkworm breeding was a part of the cultural heritage as well as economic activity in Hasırcıarnavut village which they had brought from Drama in Greece, from which they migrated in 1923. There were 1500 mulberry trees and 1000 kilograms of wet cocoon was produced in Rahmanca, Drağuşan (Akıncılar) and Küçük Altıağaç villages in 1938-39. In 1944, the number of family who grew was around 1600 and the production of wet cocoons was nearly 85,000 ton in Edirne.[398] In 1946, 20,000 mulberry saplings were distributed to peasants to develop silkworm breeding.

The Edirne Silkworm School opened three months courses in Uzunköprü and Edirne and ten youths had received a certificate in 1939. [399] This school demanded silk worm from the Agricultural Ministry to increase silkworm breeding in Edirne.[400] In addition to the 20 kilogram of pedigree mulberry seeds that was sent by Agricultural Ministry, 180 boxes mulberry seeds were brought from Bursa and Beypazarı regions by Edirne silkworm school were distributed freely to peasants in 1939.[401] The distribution continued in 1940.[402] In addition to silkworm courses, the local press of Edirne gave information about silkworm breeding.[403]

---

[397] Ibid ., p. 130.

[398] Republic of Turkey, *Poultry Husbandry, Beekeeping, Silkworm Breeding Statistics (1935-1943),* p. 21.

[399] "Böcekçilik Kursu İşe Başladı," *Edirne Postası,* 15 March 1939.

[400] "Trakya Kozacılığı İnkışafta," *Edirne Postası*, 22 February 1939.

[401] "Çiftçiye Tohumluk," *Edirne Postası,* 21 March1939.

[402] "Köylerimizde Sanat Kursları Açılıyor," *Edirne Postası*, 20 April 1940.

[403] "Böcekçi" *Edirne Postası,* 14 May 1942.

Mulberry tree cultivation improved. The government sent 20,000 mulberry saplings to Meriç, Uzunköprü and Lüleburgaz.[404] In 1946, silkworm breeding house in Edirne produced triple more than that of 1945.[405] Also in 1946, 860 boxes of silkworm and 1000 brochures about silkworm breeding were distributed to peasants.[406] However, since there was no market -oriented production as much as in Bursa, the sale price of silkworms in Edirne was lower. Similarly, there were fewer purchasers therefore there was no competition to increase the price.[407] The stock exchange price of silkworm was around 150 kuruş.[408] Due to the gradually decreasing rate of silkworm cocoon from 1939 onwards, there were fewer merchants. In order to prevent undercut, cocoon drying kiln was built in the garden of the Edirne Silkworm Breeding House.[409] Thus peasants could sell their products whenever they wanted.

The Agricultural Policies of the Government

Agricultural and Art Courses

In addition to silkworm breeding courses, other art and agricultural courses had importance in the socio-economic life of Edirne. Generally these courses were opened by Ministry of National Education and Agricultural Ministry and these courses aimed at providing the youths with occupation. They continued four months

[404] "Ziraat Vekaleti 1100 Kutu Böcek Dağıtacak,"*Edirne Postası*, 22 March 1939.

[405] "Trakya da Kozacılık, "*Edirne Postası*, 6 January 1946

[406] *Edirne Postası*, 5 January 1946.

[407] "Kozalar Kurutulacak,"*Edirne Postası*, 31 May1944.

[408] *Edirne Postası*, 30 June 1943.

[409] *Edirne Postası*, 31 May 1944.

and participants received diplomas. For example there were horseshoeing, needlecraft, bee keeping, and Carpentry and forging.[410] These courses also presented practical information that contributed to agriculture. For example, these courses enabled local people to weave their cotton yarn, silk yarn and short sheep wool. Thus they were able to continue to produce their cultures in carpet in rug and in towel. These courses were mostly opened in densely populated villages such as Pehlivanköy, Hasköy and Kurtbey. Many inhabitants of these villages attended these courses.[411]Similarly, since many women in Edirne region showed a great interested in weaving at hand looms, government sent 60 hand looms and opened ten weaving courses in big villages of Meriç, İpsala, Keşan and Uzunköprü.[412] Therefore marketing and cooperation were suggested.[413]

The Republican regime believed that peasants got behind with economic and social welfare. Therefore, in order to provide peasants with the social and economic development of villages, these courses had importance. For example the state established tree nurseries, stations of apiculture, poultry husbandry and rabbit raising, village museums, and sport arenas were established in rural areas.[414] Edirne People's House took the initiatives in these courses. In nine different courses, almost 40 teachers took charge in and almost 2000 students received training. Moreover, beekeeping courses in Edirne were given by Dr. Fuat who was one of the biggest teachers in beekeeping branch. In addition, 120 chiefs of the village and 40 village clerks participated in these courses. With almost 600 students, physics, chemistry

[410] *Edirne Postası,* 21 January 1940.

[411] " El Tezgahları Faaliyete Geçti," *Edirne Postası*, 12 February 1941.

[412] "Halk Evimiz Çalışıyor," *Edirne Postası,* 25 May1940.

[413] *Edirne Postası,* 12.February1941.

[414] *Edirne Postası* 28 January, 1940.

and Mathematic courses were the most crowded.[415] Furthermore, similar to cooperatives,[416] General Kazım Dirik, who was the Thrace Public Inspectors, supervised the opening of village museums.[417] These museums might be thought as ethnographic museums that reflected older social life of people. For example there were pots, wooden and iron ploughs, and clothing[418]

Agriculture Credit Cooperatives and Agriculture Sale Coopertives

There were almost 80 agricultural cooperatives in Thrace in 1939 and the number of these institutions was expected to reach almost 100 in 1940. Similarly, the member of Agricultural Cooperative increased from 400 to 1200 in 1939. These cooperatives supported Turkish peasants financially. Thus peasants became indebted legally to these institutions and gained economic strength against usurers. As a result of the agreements with the General Directorate of the Agricultural Bank, the Agricultural Credit Cooperatives that ranked among sale cooperatives tried to supply with cash need and machinery support of its associates. For example, thanks to the cooperatives, the farmers in Uzunköprü sold around 20 wagons of melons to Germany.[419] For example Arif Necip Kaskatı who was one of the prominent authors of *Edirne Postası Newsapaper* mentions about the importance of the cooperative in his article "I found an example of republican village" He says that Yeniköy

[415] *Edirne Postası,* 25 May1940.

[416] "Trakyamızda Zirai Kalkınma, "*Edirne Postası,* 2 March 1939.

[417] *Edirne Postası*, 25 May 1940.

[418] *Edirne Postası,* 10 May1940.

[419]*Edirne Postası*, 2 March 1939.

Agricultural Cooperative was managed by the youths who had been raised in that village and many of them graduated from İstanbul and Ankara Universities.[420]

The Credit Facilities of the Agricultural Bank

When the socio-economic development of the farmers is taken into account, the government needed to provide farmers and recent arrived immigrants with incentive credits. Due to demands that had come from different provinces, drought, floods and various plant diseases, the government provided financial assistance through Agricultural Bank in 1939. For example, financial assistance of government was in the amount of 3,750,000 TL and also consisted of food and seed to plant. [421] Agricultural Bank decided to pay in advance 50 kuruş per capita to the owners of sheep in the beginning of 1941.[422] The Agricultural Bank distributed agricultural credits directly or by means of the cooperatives in 1943. Total amount of this credit was almost 70 million TL. The Agricultural Bank purchased almost 180,000 tons of cereals in regions where there was no Soil Product Office. [423] Due to frosts and winter conditions, the government sent 1450 tons wheat to be distributed to different regions from 14 November 1947 onwards.[424] In 1947 another important agricultural credits were thought for farmers who were involved in viticulture. Furthermore, the government would support grape producers with agricultural credits that were three percent interest rate for a period of ten years.[425]

---

[420] Arif Necip Kaskatı," Örnek Bir Cumhuriyet Köyü Buldum," *Edirne Postası*, 23 February 1946.

[421] "Çiftçilere ve Göçmenlere Mikyasta Yardım Edilecek," *Edirne Postası*, 25 November 1939

[422] "Ziraat Bankamız," *Edirne Postası* 12 February 1941.

[423] Çiftçiye Yapılan Yardımlar," *Edirne Postası* 12January 1944.

[424] *Edirne Postası*, 12 November 1947.

[425] "Bağ Yetiştireceklere Kolaylık," *Edirne Postası,* 21June1947.

Transportation Facilities in Edirne Province

The terrain of Edirne was suitable for the construction of railways and highways. The railway between İstanbul and Thessaloniki passed through Edirne. The railways in Thrace were constructed in 1870. The asphalt road that connected eventually İstanbul to the English Channel *(Manş Denizi)* passed from Edirne. The length of this road through Edirne to İstanbul was almost 240 km. The construction of this road was expected to be ended in 1940. In addition to this, Edirne was also connected to Uzunköprü and Gelibolu.[426] Therefore, the Ministry of Public Works worked intensively. These roads provided the transportation of people, transportation of goods, and services. In this period, both of these highways and railways in Edirne crossed national borders. In 1940, the highways among the provinces of Thrace were repaired. On the way between İpsala and Keşan, some construction of bridges and causeways that made difficult transportation was repaired.[427] Also in the end of 1940, four kilometers of the railway track between Edirne and Svilengrad that had been damaged almost completely by flood were repaired in 1941.[428] In total, while there was nearly 260 km of causeway in 1942, it increased to 290 km in 1946 in Edirne.[429] There were four buses to go İstanbul from Edirne in 1948.[430]

During the 1940s, due to the large size of the plain in the Ergene basin and being at the junction point, Uzunköprü was one of the most prominent towns in terms of economic development and mobility. Uzunköprü might be regarded as an

[426] "Edirne İstanbul Yolu İnşaatı Hızla İlerliyor,"*Edirne Postası,* 2 March 1939.

[427] "İktisadi Birer Can Damarı Olan Yol İnşaatına Hız Verildi,"*Edirne Postası*, 4 June1940.

[428] *Edirne Postası,* 4 March 1941.

[429]Republic of Turkey, *Annual Statistics (1948,* p. 503.

[430] "Şimendifer Hattının İşlemeye Açılışında Mahzur Yoktur," *Edirne Postası*, 21 January1948

economic hub for both the surrounding towns, such as Meriç, İpsala and Keşan and the surrounding villages. Railway track increased the economic potential of Uzunköprü. Therefore, agricultural products, notably sugar beet and wheat, which were brought from surrounding settlements to Uzunköprü, could be transported by meaning highways in the 1940s.[431] Furthermore, similar to the Uzunköprü- Alpullu railway track, the government planned to construct a railway between Uzunköprü and Keşan[432] to provide an economic development and socio-economic integration in Edirne. Specifically thanks to this project, the cultivation area of sugar beet would have been increased. However, this project had not been realized.

The Second World War prevented railway access to Svilengrad in Bulgaria. As soon as Turkey received news about the preparation of the German army in Yugoslavia and Greece, Turkey transferred military units from Thrace to Anatolia and destroyed all of the bridges that were on the Maritsa River.[433] Therefore, in order to provide with the transportation of people and the flows of goods, temporary wooden bridge was constructed.[434]

The İstanbul - Selanik railway track passed through Alpullu and Pehlivanköy towns of Kırklareli before continuing to Uzunköprü. On the way to Edirne, however this railway was passing through Pityon in Greece. Since the railways between Edirne and Uzunköprü passed through Greek territory, sometimes train services were halted during Greek Civil War in the 1940s. [435] Greece had financial problem and thus the Greek government raised railway rates by 200 percent between Python and

[431] *Edirne Postası*, 10 April 1940.

[432] "Demiryolu İnşaatı Programında Trakya," *Edirne Postası,* 10 February1946

[433]Bakar, p. 5.

[434] *Edirne Postası*, 9 July1941.

[435] *Edirne Postası* ,21 January 1948.

Edirne in 1945. Since Turkey paid its debt dollar exchange, it was expensive. [436] In addition, communist groups in Greece attacked Maraş village, Çörek Village and Sofulu township in Greece and they both kidnapped almost 60 youths and damaged the railway between Python and Edirne in 1947.[437] For these reasons, railroad transportation was not preferred in Greek Territory. In Bulgarian side, railway transportation reached as far as Kapıkule. In order to arrive at Uzunköprü, people had to use main roads.[438] After the exceptional war conditions in Greece and flooding, another important block in regular transportation was the strike of Greek rail workers.

The Influence of Floods of the Maritsa River on Agricuture

Although the Maritsa flooded several times, there were two floods during the 1940s such as 1940-41 and 1947 years. The RPP Edirne Deputy, Fatma Memik addressed questions about the flood of the Maritsa River to Minister of Public Works Ali Fuat Cebesoy in 1939. Memik specified that 1500 dönüms sugar beet had submerged and also this made difficult to drain swampland in Maritsa River. Cebesoy replied that the reclamation of the Maritsa had been negotiated but in order to get result, they needed ten years. [439]As a measure, Turkey had built barriers around Bosna Village of Edirne, around Eskiköy of Uzunköprü and around Sarıcaali village of İpsala along Maritsa River in 1939. To build barriers, government spent 8,000

[436]Republic of Turkey TBMM Tutanak Dergisi, term. 8, session. 3, vol.20, December 1945, p. 536

[437] "Çeteciler Hududumuza yakın Yunan Köylerine Taaruza Başladılar," *Edirne Postası,* 21 June 1947.

[438] *Edirne Postası*, 21January 1948.

[439]Republic of Turkey, Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi Zabıt Ceridesi, term 7, session 7. vol. 2, 3 May 1939.

thousand Turkish liras.[440] However, the water had reached almost six metres in the Maritsa basin which had led to flooding, power failure and blocks in railway access.[441] Since there was no railway access between Svilengrad and Alpullu, transportation to Edirne was halted.[442] Therefore to some extent, postal services and transportation of citizens were provided through highways. Municipal workers, police officers, gendarme and firemen worked to save people who suffered from flood in 1940-41.[443] On the other hand the flood in 1947 was not as big as in December 1940 and January 1941. It resulted from snow melting. [444] The Ekmekçioğlu Ahmet Paşa Bridge on Tunca River was destroyed.[445]

Due to the flood of 1941, 400,000 dönüms of agricultural lands were damaged. Futhermore, Bosnaköy and Edeköy which were situated close to the Maritsa River were mostly influenced by flood. Almost 270 of 400 households in Bosnaköy migrated to the Tayakadın village of Edirne. Every household was given 80 dönüms of agricultural land by Government. [446] Similarly another village that was influenced by flood was Edeköy (Kadıdondurma). The villagers were forced to flee one or two kilometres to the east. Since silk worm breeding was an important economic activity, the fertile plain of Edeköy was planted with mulberry trees. This flood led to economic losses in region. For example, the production of wet cocoons in 1941 decreased four times in comparison with 1940 and 1942 in Edirne.[447]

---

[440] "Meriç Sahillerinde İnşaat Devam Ediyor," *Edirne Postası,* 18 February 1939.

[441] *Edirne Postası*, 14 December1940.

[442] *Edirne Postası* ,18 December 1940.

[443] *Edirne Postası* ,11 December1940.

[444] "Edirne Su Baskınına Uğradı," *Edirne Postası* 29 January 1947.

[445] Serkan Genç, "Edirne Tunca Bölgesinde Sürdürülebilir Yerleşmenin Yeniden Biçimlendirilmesi,"p. 51.

[446] *Edirne Postası*, 20 July1941.

[447]Republic of Turkey, *Poultry Husbandry, Beekeeping, Silkworm Breeding Statistics (1935-1943)*, p. 21.

Therefore Red Crescent sent economic assistance in the amount of almost 6000 TL.[448]

Marketing Facilities of Agricultural Products

In certain days of week, producers set an open market in different towns and of Edirne. Thus producers could sell their agricultural and dairy products such as legumes, milk and honey to consumers without the need for middlemen.[449] Besides, *panayır* (fairs) and festivals were places where both cultural exchanges and economic gains were realized. The fairs of Çörek village in Greece which was situated two kilometers far from the borders of Turkey and Greece is good example of this economic and cultural exchange. Relatives who lived in distinct countries had the opportunity to meet.[450]In addition to maintaining cultural heritage and social cohesions, fairs and festivals were places of economic activities. Since there was no middlemen, fairs in Thrace enabled peasants to supply their goods and receive their food needs cheaply.[451] Similarly, in the marketing of the agricultural and dairy products, Kırkpınar oil wrestling also enabled many peasants to set up on open market.[452]

[448]"Kızılay Kurumunun Edirne Seylabzedelerine Çok Kıymetli Yardımları Devam Ediyor," *Edirne Postası*, 12 February, 1941.

[449] "Pazar Yeri İsteniyor," *Edirne Postası,* 8 February 1939.

[450] *Edirne Postası,* 21 January1940.

[451] *Edirne Postası*, 15 May1941.

[452] "Tarihi ve Meşhur Kırkpınar Güreşlerine Dün Başlandı," *Edirne Postası*, 17 May 1945.

The Socio-economic Life of Peasants during Second World War

Although Turkey did not participate in the Second World War, the RPP government made a great effort to remain neutral in the international area and took drastic measures for socio-economic life. No doubt Edirne was very close to the battlefield and the enforcement of tax acts such as the National Protection Law and the Soil Products Law had serious importance. However, these laws created socio-economic problems between the peasants and the RPP government. Özkan and Temizer summarize the whole process laconically.

> Turkey was affected to a large extent on the international economic scale though she did not join the World War II. The production and import was diminished while the necessities of food supply rose because of the war conditions. The black marketing was triggered since the people unnecessarily stocked the foodstuffs and the state monopoly over the food reserves. The black marketing was influential so that reason of the state prevention measures for foodstuffs was inadequate.[453]

Edirne began to experience war economy from 1939 onwards. Government tried to meet the food needs of cities and army, but the transportation of wheat and fuel woods from villages were serious problems in Edirne.[454]Furthermore according to the claims of one miller, although wheat was bought at lower price than those of İstanbul, the price of bread in Edirne was 20 kuruş higher. However, the mayor of Edirne, Şerif Bilgen, said that the required observations had been made and no reason had been found to decrease the price of bread. [455]In contrast to this decision, a few months later, Edirne Municipality banned the sale of unlabelled flour sacks and

[453] M. Selçuk Özkan, Abidin Temizer,"İkinci Dünya Savaşı yıllarında Türkiye'de Karaborsacılık," *Uluslararsı Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi* 2, no. 9 (2009), p. 319.

[454] "Ekmek Niçin Ucuzlamıyor?" *Edirne Postası* ,15 February 1939.

[455] "Ekmek Meselesi Mevcut mudur?" *Edirne Postası,* 28 February 1939.

the municipality declared that shopkeepers, who opposed this decision, would be punished.[456]

Due to its climate, generally agricultural products matured late in Edirne. Therefore, Edirne purchased some agricultural crops from other cities. In scarcity years during war period, due to the difficulty in the transporting foodstuffs, taxes and hire purchases led to a raise in the sale price of these products. However, the reasons for high price were not limited to these factors. The existence of merchants who wanted to make highest profit from the black market was another important reason. For example the price of one kilogram pepper was 15 kuruş in İstanbul; it was 35 kuruş in Edirne. Local people were suffering from these high prices in their socio-economic life. Abidin Oktay was claiming in his article about "Cost of Living in Edirne" that those undeserved gains and the high cost of living in Edirne region through black market were illegal.[457] Therefore, the local press called the government to take measures in the socio-economic policies. According to an article of *Edirne Postası*, profiteers were shown as a kind of germ that led officials into dishonor, led peasants into nonethical behavior in social life and led retailers into groan with pain before the law.[458]

The Implementation of the National Protection Law in Edirne in 1940

The National Protection Law was enacted in January 1940. This law empowered the RPP government to determine prices, confiscate all products and employ citizens on a compulsory basis. In order to strengthen national defense, the

[456] "Belediyenin Etiketi Olmayan Unların Satışı YasakEdildi,"*Edirne Postası,* 30 February 1939.

[457] Abidin Oktay, "Edirne'de Hayat Pahalılığı," *Edirne Postası,* 05 June 1940

[458] "Milli Korunma Ölüm Korkusuyla Mümkündür," *Edirne Postası,* 12 January 1944.

RPP government took some precautions. First, in forced labor, people could be employed at a charge in state farms, mines, and agricultural enterprises that belonged to the state or private owners. However, women could be employed only in their villages or towns. To increase agricultural productions, the government could distribute agricultural machine, pesticides, and seeds to farmers. It would send tractors, threshing machines and two and half millions agricultural machines that had been bought from the US to nine different agricultural areas. [459] By the end of the survey of Agricultural Ministry in the 1940s, Ministry determined that the sale price of wheat changed from region to region. Therefore government tried to provide a single price in the sale of wheat. Within the scope of the National Protection Law in 1940, the governments hold peasants who had wheat, rye and oat responsible for reporting to the directorate for trade. [460] In return, their crops would be bought for ready money.[461]

To put an end competitive environment and react to the price policy of government through the National Protection Law, many bakers agreed with each other and some of them closed their bakeries temporarily. Similarly, according to their agreements, the bakers who closed their bakeries would become partners with the winnings of those who had worked their bakeries. Just as the supply of bread decreased, its quality decreased. Just as lots of workers in bakeries became unemployed, citizens had difficulty in finding bread.[462] The Edirne Municipality however did not accept any decrease in the quality of bread. As municipality claimed, since the adjacent regions had bought too much bread from the bakeries of

[459] "Milli Korunma Kanununun Zirai Kısımları Tatbik Edilecek," *Edirne Postası,* 11 May 1940.

[460] "Buğday Fiyatları Her yerde Aynı Olacak,"*Edirne Postası*, 14 December 1940

[461] "Ziraat Vekaletine 1941 Hububatına El Koyma Salahiyeti Verildi," *Edirne Postası,* 9 July 1941.

[462] Ekmek Buhranı mı ?"*Edirne Postası*, 7 August 1940.

Edirne, the scarcity of bread had emerged. Otherwise, the Soil Product Office provided a sufficient amount of flour and the mills sent how much flour they had prepared to bakers. [463] Several days later, since the Soil Product Office was responsible for hoarding to meet the cereal need of Turkey,[464] it sent eighteen wagons of wheat to Edirne Municipality on the purpose of hoarding in 1941.[465] In the bakeries of Edirne, by blending ten percent of rye flour with wheat flour, a brown rye bread would be made.[466] It was nutritious and its sale price was 12 kuruş.[467] Since there was intensive corn cultivation in the villages of Edirne, many peasants were mixing corn flour and wheat flour to make bread.[468]

These issues were being disputed in the Turkish Grand National Assembly. Upon the question of Berç Keresteciyan Türker, Emin Sazak and Hikmet Bayur about the abolition of the Wheat Protection Tax, the Ministry of the Commerce Mümtaz Ökmen replied that there was no bread or seed scarcity in the country. However, Ökmen said that the hoarding of bread was leading to bread scarcity. Agricultural Ministery Muhlis Erkmen stated that the government had made provision against potential drought and encouraged the cultivation of corn in the areas where irrigated farming was possible. [469]

The RPP government tried to control economic activities; therefore the government decided to found a *Subaşı* Organization. This organization consisted of experienced farmers and they would go to play a significant role in carrying out the

[463] "Şehirde Ekmek Neden Bulunamıyor?" *Edirne Postası,* 28 August 1940.

[464] "Buğday Satışlarını Devlet Murakabası Altına Aldı," *Edirne Postası*,14 December 1940.

[465] "Edirne'de Un ve Ekmek Sıkıntısı Kalmadı," *Edirne Postası*, 25 October 1940

[466] "Bir Çeşit Ekmek Çıkarılacak" *Edirne Postası*,12 February 1941.

[467] "Edirne'nin Ekmek İşi," *Edirne Postası*, 2 April 1941.

[468] Nevzat Hanımeli, Interview by author, at home, in Akçadam Village, Edirne, Turkey, 10 July 2013.

[469] "Buğdayı Koruma Vergisinin Kaldırıması Kabul Edildi," *Edirne Postası,* 1 April1942

agricultural and rural policy of the government.[470] While the Second World War continued, agricultural mobilization was encouraged by the RPP government in Thrace. Through the channels of the Agricultural ministry, the government sent supplementary appropriations to support notably the cultivation of sugar beet, potato, and also the production of wheat, rye, barley, oat and canary grass.[471] Similarly the government made a major contribution to the cultivation of rice in the fertile lands of the Ergene basin in Uzunköprü and the fertile lands of the Meriç basin in İpsala.[472]

The government that had extraordinary authority to regulate socio-economic life decided to establish the Community Distribution Associations (Halk Dağıtım Merkezi) was decided to be founded in May 1942. It made easy the distribution of foodstuffs such as bread, sugar and oil.[473] These institutions were founded in central places such as Manyas, İmaret, and Saraçhane in Edirne. The personnel who worked at the Community Distribution Associations consisted of neighborhood headmen (mukhtars) and a board of aldermen. However, one year later, personnel of the municipality were assigned to this institution.[474] Until August 1942, fruits and vegetables were sold by tale. This was abolished by the Edirne municipality.[475]

Due to the Turkish National Protection Law in 1940, there decreased 50 percent in the cereal in the Edirne region. In accordance with the decision of coordination, just as the sale of sugar had been banned, the government seized panicum and canary grass. The government demanded to be reported sugar stock in the region. Similarly, government declared that the date of sale of sugar and its prices

[470] *Edirne Postası*, 14 May 1942.

[471] *Edirne Postası*,10 June 1942.

[472] *Edirne Postası,* 17June1942.

[473] M. Selçuk Özkan, Abidin Temizer,"İkinci Dünya Savaşı yıllarında Türkiye'de Karaborsacılık," p. 320.

[474] *Edirne Postası* ,15 July1942.

[475] *Edirne Postası*, 5 August1942.

would be determined.[476] After a while in Edirne, since the production of sugar was sufficient in this region, the government released the sale of sugar. At this time, the government decided to seize surplus amounts of cereal, flour, and fat. [477] The Edirne governorship declared that people who got surplus amount of flour had to submit a declaration. Otherwise, in accordance with the National Protection Law, the legal process would be begun against them.[478]

In order to prevent hoarding at the time when the war had escalated along with İstanbul, Ankara and İzmir, İt was decided that bread would be distributed through rationing with the declaration of Edirne governorship.[479] In March 1942, distribution through rationing started but weather conditions were the biggest prevention in transformation. For elderly, 600 gram of bread, for younger people 300 grams of bread, and also for workers 750 gram of bread were determined.[480] The government forced bakeries to work overtime. Thus government aimed to stock bread for the people who got bread by means of rationing. [481] Therefore most of them were stale bread. In Edirne, 150 grams of bread were distributed per person.[482]

When this amount of bread was not sufficient, in order to get more bread, some people applied to get new ration cards on the pretext of losing. However, since the government determined them, new bread tickets were not given.[483] Thus people started to live in panic and they did not know what to do. However, bread was not the

[476] *Edirne Postası,* 21January 1942.

[477] *Edirne Postası*, 31 January1942.

[478] *Edirne Postası*, 11 February 1942.

[479] *Edirne Postası*, 24 December 1941.

[480] *Edirne Postası*, 4 March 1942.

[481] *Edirne Postası,* 12 March 1942.

[482] *Edirne Postası,* 17 October 1942.

[483] *Edirne Postası*, 4 March1942.

only problem. Honey, meat, rice and bulgur could not be found in Edirne.[484] In Edirne where animal husbandry was developed, people had difficulty finding butter and white cheese. Furthermore, in winter, when people could not reach Edirne from the villages, a scarcity of butter appeared.[485]Following the disappearance of white cheese, kashar cheese also disappeared. However, according to the claims of some inhabitants, there was a sufficient amount of cheese in the hands of merchants. [486]

Although it was said that the distribution of bread through rationing had started to be abolished in many cities except İstanbul, Ankara and İzmir, this could not seem possible at first in Edirne. Furthermore, the invasion of Hitler in Greece posed a serious threat to social and economic life in Edirne. Rationing was abolished in November in1942.[487]The sale price of 600 grams bread was 40 kuruş. Citizens were not content with the quality of bread therefore, they thought that the bakeries and mills had to be controlled. [488]The low price policy of the state and the transportation of wheat from the villages to Edirne were big problems and increased flour shortages. Many peasants were trying to sell their cereals at higher price which led to black marketeering. The Edirne Municipality sent a committee to Konya to purchase bread.[489]

After the government raised the price of wheat in 1942, the price of bread increased as well.[490] Although subsistence stores were sold at high prices in the stock market, the government introduced the policy of cheap bread to official, retirees and

[484] "Hayat Pahalılığı," *Edirne Postası,* 20 December 1942.

[485] "Mandıralar Faaliyete Geçti," *Edirne Postası,* 01 April1942.

[486] "Peynir Buhranını Kaşar Yokluğu Takip Etti," *Edirne Postası* ,01April 1941.

[487] *Edirne Postası*, 12 August 1942.

[488] *Edirne Postası*, 7 November 1942.

[489] *Edirne Postası,* 12 August 1942.

[490] *Edirne Postası*, 22 July 1942.

widows to offset prices.[491] The Edirne Municipality declared that it was necessary for people to pick up their ration cards from security chief offices in Karaağaç, Ayşekadın, Kıyık, Muradiye, Yeniimaret, and Manyas between the dates 16 June and 23 June 1943.[492] According to an article of *Edirne Postası*, the price of bread was determined by the municipalities. However, in this determination, the decision of the Soil Product Offices about the sale price of flour and cereal was taken as a reference point by municipalities. Cake, muffin and ship biscuits could be made with 79/81 productive flour. The transportation ban on noodle, pasta and biscuits through by way of state was abolished 18 January 1945 onwards. [493] Government released the sale of wheat after 10 October 1946.[494]

The desperate economic situation of people forced the Edirne municipality and the Red Crescent into collaboration. After negotiations between two state institutions, they agreed upon cheap bread and hot meal for lunch. Furthermore Red Crescent decided to set up soup kitchen in the Karaağaç district of Edirne. By applying to Red Crescent, Edirne People's House provided hot meals to almost 600 poor students. [495]In the same way, the Soil and Product Office distributed 40 tons of rye to the poor.[496] The aid campaign of the Red Crescent was not limited to the inhabitants of Edirne. The organization played an important role in starting aid to the Turkish soldiers who provided the security of Edirne. According to the news of *Edirne Postası*, the people of city donated almost 1940 parcels of goods to the soldiers. This number increased incrementally and reached almost 3800 parcel goods

[491] *Edirne Postası,* 17 October 1940.

[492] *Edirne Postası,* 19 June1943.

[493] "Ekmek İstihkakı Yarın Arttırılıyor," *Edirne Postası,* 17 January 1945.

[494] "1947 Buğday Bütçesi Meclise Verildi," *Edirne Postası*, 05 January 1946.

[495] *Edirne Postası*, 23 January1943.

[496] *Edirne Postası,* 28.April 1943.

in the end of 1940.[497] These parcels which consisted of socks, gloves, pullovers and undershirt were accepted by the Red Crescent.[498]

The Soil Product Tax of 1944

Since government failed in the levying of the National Protection Tax, the Soil Product Tax was enacted in 1944. It was regarded as a solution to state's extraordinary expenditures for national defense and to supplying the food needs of soldiers who had been conscripted into the army and citizens who lived in cities.[499] Due to the resistance of the villagers and missing their crops from the supervision of state, the government was unable to collect of tax properly in 1940. Therefore, the Soil Products Tax was enacted in 1943. It was revised in 1944 and continued until 1947.

Danış Yurdakul, who was the governor of Edirne made an observation and gave orders about the collection of Soil Products Tax in the villages of Edirne in 1943.[500] The government demanded peasant make statement about their agricultural crops. However, the prices of agricultural products were cheap and peasants struggled to survive in Edirne. They could not find enough food due to scarcity. Therefore they were deeply occupied with hiding their crops from the state officials who came to their villages due to the Soil Product Tax. Similar to Danış Yurdakul,

[497] "Kahraman Orduya Edirne'nin Hediyesi," *Edirne Postası,* 14 December 1940.

[498] "Kahraman Askerlerimize Edirnelilerin Hediyesi," *Edirne Postası,* 2 November 1940.

[499]Metinsoy, p. 123.

[500] "Valimizin Köy Tetkikleri," *Edirne Postası,* 11 June1943.

new governor of Edirne Süheyp Karafakıoğlu, chief of police and gendarme commander visited Uzunköprü, Meriç, İpsala and Keşan to inspect in 1944.[501]

Government assigned a tax commission that consisted of the regional chief, the chief of the village, weighing officials and office watchmen to levy the Soil Product Tax. Edirne province was separated into 23 areas each of which consisted of five villages. [502] The commissions who went to villages, farms or quarters of Edirne would submit a statement to the government about the number of cocoons and the amount of agricultural products in the fields and harvested.[503] According to the news of *Edirne Postası*, in the collection of Soil Product Tax, ten percent of agricultural products were levied as the Soil Product Tax, as a unit of measure, the *şinik* that was 8 kilograms would be used and also two types of tax system would be implemented by this commission. These were tax in kind and monetary tax. Monetary tax system was conducted to some agricultural products that could not be kept in the stores of the Soil Product offices such as grape, potato and sugar beet and so on. On the other hand, ten percent of agricultural crops that could be stored for a long term in stores were taken as tax in kind such as cereals, rice, corn and cotton and so on.[504] While almost 5000 tons of cereals were taken from the farmers 1943; almost 10,000 tons within the scope of Soil Product Tax were taken in 1944 For example the Soil Product Tax demanded 500 tons of rice, 800 tons of corn and 170 tons of legumes in Edirne. [505] The sale of wheat and flour were liberated after October 1946, on the other hand the export of oil seeds such as sesame and sunflower were banned.[506]

---

[501] "Valimiz Mülhakatta," *Edirne Postası,* 31 May 1944.

[502] Toprak Mahsulleri Vergisi Nasıl Alınacak ?" *Edirne Postası,* 11 June 1943.

[503] "Toprak Mahsulleri Vergisi İçin Beyanname Mecburiyeti" *Edirne Postası* 11 June1943.

[504]*Edirne Postası*, 11 June 1943.

[505] "1943 Mahsulü Çok Feyizli," *Edirne Postası,* 12 January 1944.

[506] *Edirne Postası,* 5 Ekim 1946.

As Metinsoy explains, in the Edirne region, by colluding among 20 peasants, the chief of the village, the weighing official and office watchmen, they concealed 400 kilos of wheat in the storehouse of the weighing official. However, when this illegal event reverted to court, all of these people were convicted and they were arrested by the gendarme on charges of tax evasion.[507] Similarly, another example Metinsoy gives from İskender village of Edirne. The chief of the village and the weighing officials misused their positions by accepting bribes from the villagers.[508] Many peasants claimed that they had put aside boiled and bound wheat, flour, and seed wheat to hide from the supervision of weighing officials.

According to narratives of inhabitants who lived in Rahmanca Village, the use of chemical manure was low. This type of manure had been coming by means of the Beet Company to villages. In traditional agriculture, rather than scientific results, previous experiences and the views of elders and opinion leaders were more important for younger farmers. However these prominent people had no experience with chemical manure. For example, when the peasants asked about the use of chemical manure to the chief of Rahmanca village Mehmet Ceylan, he said that he had used a small amount of chemical manure but he had not been pleased with it.[509] The peasants continued to use animal manure. Edirne Deputy Mehmet Öktem declared that the government should support the use of animal manure or farm manure, to increase productivity in agriculture.[510]

Generally, peasants who involved in raising sheep used more animal manure in their fields. Agricultural productivity was low and they struggled to make a living.

---

[507] Metinsoy, p. 132.

[508] Ibid., p. 146.

[509] Hayri Gezer, Interview by author, in coffeehouse, in Rahmanca Village Edirne, Turkey, 10 July 2013.

[510]Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi Zabıt Ceridesi, term 8, session 3, vol 8, 5 December 1947

For example, peasants could only get five canisters wheat from two dönüms. However, with the implementation of the Soil Product Tax, they applied more radical solution. In one example, the peasants in the villages of Meriç town many peasants harvested their wheat, corn and rye before they matured. After many peasants were dried these crops on their porches, they ground these cereals to make flour. Secondly, they used less animal manure in their fields and thus they produced as much as they consumed as boiled and pounded wheat and put aside as seed.

Many peasants remembered these years of poverty and food shortage. For example, a thick soup made with flour was common meal. Furthermore, the roots of couch grass, lamb's lettuce and patience dock which they picked from pasturelands were among the foods of many peasants. Since sugar was expensive and transportation by means of saddle horses or oxen was limited to Uzunköprü where there was sugar transportation through railway, peasants tried to meet their sugar needs through fruits such as raspberries.[511] Poverty was endemic in rural areas. The poverty was accompanied by cheap labor. Many economically deprived of peasants were working for their board on lands of wealthier families in the villages in return for a jar of sugar or flour. Since sugar was scarce, even flour halva was regarded as a luxury.[512]

In the strictest sense of the word, food shortages and poverty in the environment of exceptional war condition and government intervention in the socio-economic lives of the peasants led to smuggling between the frontier villages. Moreover 1941 and 1942 years were known as years of smuggling in Edirne. According to the narratives of local peasants, through the exchange of goods,

[511] Mehmet Dere, Interview by author, in coffeehouse, in Rahmanca Village Edirne, Turkey, 20 July 2013.

[512] İbrahim Ceylan, Interview by author, at home, in Rahmanca Village Edirne, Turkey, 20 July 2010.

Turkish and Greek peasants who live in border villages along the Maritsa River met their food requirements mutually. For example the Turkish peasants mainly bought clothes, wine and filament yarn from the Greek peasants, and in return they sold corn, sheep, rye, soap, animal oil and cordwood to Greek peasants.[513] In central district, Edirne, Sümer Bank which followed a new path in terms of institutional work during the scarcity years, prepared rayon in the name of domestic good market in the Edirne stock market building. In this market, printed cotton and cloth were sold. [514]

The Prominent News about Land Reform in Edirne Press between 1945 and 1948

All these taxations and economic hardships worried the RPP government for next elections. Therefore, there was some news about land distribution in journals in 1944. The RPP government had translated 100 pages of a report that was about the experience of 13 countries in land distribution. As Agricultural Ministry Şevket Ratip Hatiboğlu stated, mostly public lands that were redundant and uncultivated had been distributed, however, providing that it was paid, some farms in the scope of private ownership was tried to be included in this land distribution.[515] In land distribution, firstly the distribution of public land was decided. The Council of Minister was interested in this subject and equitable distribution was aimed.[516]

[513] Hayri Gezer, Ibrahim Ceylan, Mehmet Dere, Hamit Top, Interview by author, in coffeehouse in Rahmanca Village Edirne, Turkey, 10 July 2013.

[514] *Edirne Postası*, 1 August 1942.

[515] "Topraksız Çiftçiye Toprak Dağıtımı," *Edirne Postası,* 12 January1944.

[516] *Edirne Postası,* 17 December 1946.

The number of big landowners who had more than 5000 dönüms of land was 25 in Edirne in 1938.[517] Before the war period, to some extent, government distributed lands from public domains and the fields left by the Greeks who forced to leave during the population exchange. However during war period, this policy was interrupted. Namely, this could be regarded as the continuation of the land distribution that had been interrupted by the Second World War. When the land distribution law was being discussed at the council in 1945, it led to a split in opinion in the RPP. Although land distribution decreased during WWII, land distribution had continued in Edirne since 1920. However, no concrete steps were taken in the implementation of Land Reform in 1945 until 1948. Similarly a column that was written in *Vatandaş* newspaper by Kemal Özer suggested that the land reform needed to be exercised immediately. Even though land distribution had not made for three years, he questioned why people felicitated land festival.[518]

Conclusion

This chapter discussed the role of the government in the transformation of agricultural structures from 1939 to 1948. The comparisons of the statistical data of Edirne to the average statistical data of Turkey were examined. Since Edirne experienced the war threat more seriously, its results were the possible worst case in socio-economic life. Firstly, the changes in population were discussed during these years. Birth rate was under the average of Turkey. Due to the Second World War,

[517] Başer, p. 207.
[518] "Toprak Kanunu Derhal ve Suratle Tatbik Mevkine Koymalıyız," *Vatandaş Gazetesi*, 15 December 1948.

especially the population of Edirne and its northern towns declined. Similar to the rest of Turkey, almost 80 percent of the population was peasant in Edirne.

Based on the Questionnaire of Landed and landless Farmers, the number peasant families, draught animals and cultivable lands were presented. In order to understand the influence of WWII, the fluctuations in the cultivation areas and agricultural production were emphasized. Similar to the average of Turkey, the rate of cultivated lands decreased half in half and agricultural productivity declined. However, while the agricultural production began to decline from1939 onwards in Edirne, it started to be seen from 1942 onwards at the national level. While the cultivation area was around 1,700,000 dönüms in 1939, this decreased to around 800,000 dönüms during the war period. Cultivation areas did not recover the size of 1939, between 1946 and 1950.

In agricultural products, the cereals, industrial crops and legumes were discussed. Wheat, barley, rye, rice and corn were discussed in the group of cereal group. Sugar beet, sesame and cotton were discussed in the group of industrial crops. Bean, chickpea and bitter vetch were examined in the group of legumes. Although the rates of cereals, industrial crops and legumes were similar to the averages of Turkey, there were some differences in the cultivation area of crops in Edirne. For example, since Edirne experienced serious food shortages, in contrast to the average of Turkey, the cultivation area of corn was higher than wheat in 1943. Corn cultivation was encouraged by government in provinces where there were state of emergency and food shortage. In industrial crops, while cotton had the largest cultivation areas in the average of Turkey, sugar beet had the most cultivation areas in Edirne. No doubt the larger cultivation area of sugar beet resulted from the Alpullu Sugar Beet and more importantly the foodstuff that could be made from sugar beet.

Normally, cotton was two or three times more expensive than sugar beet. Generally since there was no mechanization, in sufficient labor force and food shortage, peasants cultivated cereals which required fewer workers and had high nutritional values.

Through forming cooperatives and the used agricultural credits, the RPP government tried to provide peasants with credits, seed aid and manure. These had more importance in the aftermath of the flood of Maritsa River in 1940 and drought in 1945. Through the cooperatives, peasants were organized and their position was strengthened in the face of merchants. Peasants could expand their marketing facilities. For example, the Agricultural Cooperatives in Uzunköprü sold almost 20 wagons of melons to Germany. Thanks to the cooperatives, farmers could be joint surety to each other and obtained credits from the Agricultural Bank.

Transportation facilities were important in the marketing of agricultural products. Although road transportations among the cities were provided to some extent in Thrace, it was not possible to travel easily between villages of Edirne. No doubt, railways were a more important means of transportation in Edirne and its immediate vicinity, Pehlivanköy, Uzunköprü and Alpullu during the 1940s. Uzunköprü could be regarded as a center in terms of economic activity. Therefore, the cultivation of industrial crops was easier in Uzunköprü. Uzunköprü had a stock exchange market and people who lived in neighboring towns and villages came to Uzunköprü for their market requirements.

Agricultural and art courses not only provided young people with occupations in their fields but also contributed to the agricultural transformation. For example, many Thracian women weaved their silk yarn, short sheep wool and cotton yarn. People maintained their cultural values. Similarly thanks to these courses, people

learned important information about apiculture, silkworm breeding, field agriculture, forging and weaving. However, these courses operated for three or four months and they were generally in the big villages.

Finally, the National Protection Law in 1940 and the Soil Product Tax in 1944 made difficult the socio-economic life in Edirne. Since the workers and draught animals had been conscripted by army, production means decreased. Thus many peasants engaged sharecropping and they had difficulty in transporting their crops to town or factories. Similarly, because many peasants were afraid to go to their fields in the Maritsa plain at frontier villages, agricultural production remained low. Many peasants could produces at subsistence level. Due to low prices, many of them hid their agricultural products from the state. Today, these years are remembered as a period of poverty and food shortages in Edirne. Although the government enacted the Land Reform, the results of 1946 general elections indicated dissatisfaction towards the agricultural policy of the RPP government in Edirne. Although the DP was found just 45 days before the elections, DP won the majority of votes and three of five deputies in Edirne. Briefly the socio-economic life in Edirne laid war economy bare. Besides, it also explained the reasons of changes in Turkish agriculture.

CHAPTER FOUR

IN THE CONTEXT OF POST WAR ECONOMIC POLICIES, THE TRANSFORMATION OF AGRICULTURE IN EDİRNE PROVINCE (BETWEEN 1948 AND 1960)

The Influence of International Developments on Turkish Economic Policy

The end of the Second World War ushered in new world order. In bipolar political system, while the US that defended capitalist economic system and liberal political thoughts was on one side, the USSR that had socialist economic and political system was on the other. The US leaded Western Bloc and the USSR leaded Eastern Bloc. The Second World War was important in determining the sphere of influence of the socialist and capitalist system. For example, since many Eastern European countries had been invaded by the USSR during the war, they had been exposed to the control of socialist regimes. On the other hand, western European countries were not under the control of the USSR, but due to their political and economic instabilities, these countries were exposed to socialist propaganda of the USSR. Furthermore, with the support of the USSR, socialist parties provoked many workers to go on strike in Italy and France.[519]

The US did not experience direct economic or military loss as much as the USSR that made a war against Germany. Furthermore, since the US sold petroleum,

[519] Barış Ertem"Türkiye –ABD İlişkilerinde Truman Doktrini ve Marshall Planı" *Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* 12, no.21(2009), p. 390.

material and powder to the allied powers, the US strengthened its economic position and came out of war with less economic loss. Although the US was in the same bloc with the USSR against the Axis Powers during war period, they had political, ideological and economic conflicts in the post war period that was also called as Cold War (between 1945 and 1990). After 1945, the US had almost half of the industry, around seventy percent of gold reserves and petroleum reserves. By the same token, the USA had sixty five percent of share in the production of corn, cotton, and iron.[520]

One of the main reasons of the Cold War between Western and Eastern Blocs were ideological conflicts that reflected the social, political, and economic life in these blocs. The aims of the US and the USSR were to increase their political and economic influence in Africa and Asia after the collapse of colonialism and the increasing political and economic power of the US as a new prominent political actor in international relations increased their competition. In general, apart from the Vietnam and Korean Wars, there was no close combat. However, both blocs competed and posed a serious threat to one another on the subjects of nuclear energy, atomic power and space probes.

The foundation of NATO and Warsaw Pacts in the 1950s was the indications of the political institutionalization of the Cold War. However, in terms of economic policy, this polarization shaped more or less the borders of economic trade. The countries that took part in the same blocs mostly had economic relations with each other. The US which was the central power of the capitalist system strengthened its economic position thanks to the Breton Woods Pacts. Thus the index of foreign

[520] Tolga Ören"Marshal Planı ve Türkiye :Tarım, Sulama, Ulaştırma, Madencilik, Özel Sektör, Emek Hareketi, Savunma ve Gündelik Yaşam Örnekleri,"*İstanbul Ticaret Odası Yayınları*, no. 67 (2010), p. 463.

exchange value of the dollar was established. Furthermore, the IMF and World Bank played important roles in the regulation of the capitalist economic system and liberal political thoughts of the Western Bloc and the US.

However, in addition to these core countries such as the USA and the USSR, there were also some periphery countries that experienced the reflections of the Cold War. Geographically, Turkey had borders with the USSR. Moreover, the USSR which emerged from WWII with power, expressed that they would not extend the process of 20 years of the Pact of Friendship and Non aggression in 1925. Besides, the USSR demanded a change in the borders of northeast Anatolia and demanded a military base in Bosporus. The Bosporus of Turkey was an important transit point for the USSR to be opened to the outer world in terms of economic, political and militaristic aspects. However, Turkey interpreted these demands as a communist threat against her national Independence. Thereupon, the US supported Turkey and Greece financially and militarily with the Truman Doctrine in 1947. Due to the westernization aims of the governments and socialist threat, Turkey preferred Western Bloc. Furthermore, Turkey entered the United Nations and passed into the multi-party political system in 1945. Also Turkey became a member of NATO in 1952.

More importantly, one of the main political aims of the US was to implement the Marshall Plan. Through Marshall Plan, the US would support the European countries that had been demolished in the Second World War. Thus the USA aimed not only to prevent the spread of communist ideology, but also to provide Western European countries with economic reconstruction. In order to make decisions about how to implement the Marshall Plan, a conference was held on 12 July 1947 in Paris with the participation of 16countries, including Turkey. At first Turkey did not take

part in the countries that were included to Marshall Plan. The US specialists thought that Turkey had better conditions in terms of foreign exchange holdings and balance of trade.[521] However, in order to be included in the Marshall Plan, Turkey applied directly to the US and similarly the Ankara ambassador of the USA sent a report to Washington which explained the economic problems of Turkey.[522]The US was well aware of the close relations between military and economic orders, and therefore Turkey was accepted to Marshall Plan.[523]

Turkey did not have enough resources to undertake economic development. Turkey set its hopes on foreign economic support.[524] In this sense, within the scope of the Marshall Plan, Turkey was charged with exporting agricultural products and raw materials for the reconstruction of Europe. Celal Bayar said that in order to carry interest from the European development; Turkey needed an economic program and the means to develop agricultural sector. Similarly, the Democrat Party supporters, who were big landowners and petit bourgeoisie, specified that Turkey had to attract foreign capital and to provide an association between the private sector and foreign capitals. They thought that this might be possible with radical changes in statism. Thanks to Marshall Plan, RPP thought that cost of living could be prevented and their government could elevate Turkey to the level of contemporary civilization. [525]

As was mentioned above, Turkey was regarded as an agricultural country in international division of labor. Turkey that took part in the western bloc would contribute to the reconstruction of Western Europe by exporting agricultural products and raw materials. Similarly, it was to import agricultural machines, pesticides,

[521] Barış Ertem,"Türkiye –ABD İlişkilerinde Truman Doktrini ve Marshall Planı," p. 392.

[522] Baskın Oran, *Türk Dış Politikası 1919-1980*, 6th edition (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002), p. 540.

[523] Ertem, p. 392.

[524] Varlı and Oktar, p. 9.

[525] Tolga Ören,"Marshal Planı ve Türkiye" p. 472.

petroleum, and manure from the Western Blocs. Through these projects, cultivated lands and agricultural production could be increased. With the building of highways that connected the rural areas to important commercial centers, the transportation of agricultural products and a more integrated market economy could be provided. This process would bring about the commodification of soil, and introduced a market oriented and capitalist mode of production in Turkey.[526]

With suitable climate conditions and intensive agricultural methods, agricultural production increased in Turkey. Due to the export of cereals and other agricultural products during Korean War, the international terms of trade of Turkey increased by 50 percent. Thus Turkey continued the process of accumulation based on commercial capital. Furthermore, the US and Canada stocked their wheat rather than export to international markets during the Korean War, so the demands for Turkish wheat in international markets increased. This situation however was temporary.[527] With the decrease in foreign demand for agricultural products of Turkey and the end of Korean War in 1953, the export of agricultural products decreased. From 1954 onwards, the Soil Product Office began buying the cereals of peasants at premium. For example, the price of one kilogram of wheat was around 29 kuruş between 1953 and 1956.[528]

The DP government did not want to decrease the price of cereals due to the populist policies. Thus the Central Bank gave short term credits to the Soil Product Office until 1958. As Keyder states, the bourgeois class who lived in urban areas was not pleased by the privileged agricultural policy of the DP and they insisted on the

[526] Keyder, *Türkiye de Devlet ve Sınıflar*, pp. 1-300.

[527] Stefanos Yerasimos, *Az Gelişmişlik Sürecinde Türkiye*, trans. Babür Kuzucu, (İstanbul: Gözlem Yayınevi, 1976), p. 1364.

[528] Republic of Turkey, *Bitkisel Üretim Miktarları, Üretici Fiyatları ve Girdiler (1948-1974)*, (Ankara: Prime Ministry, 1976), pp. 20- 23.

import substitution economic model.[529] To some extent, the economic policy of the DP was one of the leading reasons for the vicious cycle in the economy and foreign exchange bottle neck.[530] The DP government re-enacted the National Protection Law in 1956. In the end the DP government ceased liberal policies and resorted to import substitution with the 1958 devaluation.

Even though one agricultural development process was indicated with the Marshall Plan, based on the agricultural structures such as the size of cultivable lands, climate conditions, and the range of agricultural products and the use of technological developments, the agricultural transformation realized differently in different areas of Turkey. In this chapter examines how this process occurred in Edirne province. Edirne was one of the several provinces that had experienced serious war economy. Also Edirne had large amounts of cultivated lands that were suitable for implementing the doctrines of Marshall Plan such as agricultural mechanization, the use of pesticides and manure and the development of irrigation, a transportation network and marketing system. Therefore, Edirne province was one of the important sample areas to observe the role of Marshall Plan in the economic recovery clearly. This chapter examines how the story of Green Revolution, the coomodification of soils and market oriented production realized in Edirne Province.

In addition to the domestic political and economic constitutions, this chapter will discuss how international relations such as Cyprus Problem, the situation of Turkish Minority in Western Trace and communist authority in Bulgaria reflected on the socio-economic condition of Edirne as a border province. The implementation of the Marshall Plan in 1948 was an indication of liberal economic policy and

[529]Keyder*, Dünya Ekonomisi içinde Türkiye,* p. 178.

[530] Meltem Tekerek "12 Eylül Askeri Müdahalesi ve Ekonomi Politikaları*"* (MA Thesis, Ankara University, 2012), pp. 32-33

disengagement from the statist period. Therefore the period between 1948 and 1960 are studied.

Firstly the agricultural structures, such as the population employed in the agricultural sector, the increase in the cultivated lands and agricultural products that could be grown in Edirne Province will be discussed. To indicate the roles of government policies in the transformation of these agricultural structures, agricultural mechanization, land distribution policy, the building of main roads, the reclamation of the Maritsa River, the encouragement of credit facilities, agricultural courses, and marketing facilities and the influence of National Protection Law in 1956 on changing socio-economic life of Edirne province are examined.

Agricultural Structures in Edirne Province between 1948 and 1960

The Population of Edirne between 1948 and 1960

According to the census of 1950, the population of Edirne province was around 220,000. Almost 60,000 out of that number lived in cities. The rest of the population lived in rural areas. During war period, the population of Edirne had decreased by 50,000.[531] On the other hand the population of Edirne started to increase in post war period. In contrast to the war period, the population growth rate was ten percent in Edirne province from 1945 to 1950, and thus it was close to the average population growth of Turkey in 1950.[532]

In addition to the birth rate and the returns of people who had left in 1941, the refugees from Bulgaria increased the population of Edirne province. In Bulgaria,

[531] Republic of Tukey, *General Census (1950)* (Ankara: Prime Ministry, 1951) p. 14.

[532] Republic of Turkey, *Edirne İl Yıllığı*, p. 47.

there had been a clash between socialist government forces and the peasants who did not want to give their agricultural products.[533] The socialist government of Bulgaria expropriated cultivated lands and the minority schools of the Turkish population in this period. Besides, the support of Turkey to the Western Bloc during the Korean War led to the provocation and pressure of USSR on Bulgarian government to deport Turkish Minority.[534]

150,000 Turkish refugees entered Turkey in three months.[535] In order to house these, temporary immigrant houses were built in Edirne and Lalapaşa.[536] Eighty percent of these immigrants were farmers.[537] Just as some of them settled in different parts of Turkey, some immigrants were settled in the villages of Edirne. According to the Edirne governor Emin Akıncı, 300 immigrant families were settled in the villages of Edirne, such as Lulu Village (Akçadam), Kurdu Village, Karahamza and Turpçular, and farm lands and tractors were given to them. [538] The immigrants who settled in Akçadam were given 25 dönüms lands and those who settled in Karahamza were given 60 dönüms lands.[539] According to the population census of 1955, the population of Edirne was around 250,000. Similarly, nearly 180,000 out of 250,000 populations were living in villages.[540] Similar to the average of Turkey, the population growth rate of Edirne province increased around 14 percent from 1950 to 1955. Furthermore, due to large cultivated lands and the need

[533] "Bulgar Köylerinde Kargaşalar Başladı," *Edirne Postası,* 24 Ağustos 1949.

[534] Halil Şimşek, Fulya Arslan "Yeni Edirne Gazetesine Göre Bulgaristandan Türkiye'ye Göçler 1950-1951" *Çanakkale Araştırmaları Türk Yıllığı*, no.13 (Autumn, 2012), p. 110.

[535] Halil Şimşek, Fulya Arslan "Yeni Edirne Gazetesine Göre Bulgaristandan Türkiye'ye Göçler," p. 110.

[536] "Göçmen Evinde Neler Gördüm" *Edirne Postası,* 15 January 1950.

[537] *Yeni Edirne Gzetesi,* 19 June1951.

[538] *Yeni Edirne Gazetesi*, 15 May 1951.

[539] Nevzat Hanımeli, Interview by author, at home in Akçadam Village, Edirne, Turkey, 10 July 2013

[540] Republic of Turkey, *General Census (1955)* (İstanbul: Prime Ministry, 1961), p. 15.

for labor in the agricultural sector, no remarkable movements from rural to urban areas occurred in Edirne province after 1955.

Finally, due to the Greek civil war between 1944 and 1948, Turkish minority was under threat in western Thrace.[541]Both Turks and Greeks were tortured and some of them were being kidnapped in during the 1940s.[542]Almost ten years later, from 1955 onwards, there was social turmoil in Greece again. However, this time it resulted from Cyprus Issue between Turkey and Greece. In a short span of time, it turned into socio-economic problems. The properties of the Turkish minority such as their fields and meadows were expropriated and many Turks exposed to oral defamation and physical violence[543] Furthermore, Greece intervened in the election of Muslim Turkish Community.[544]By preventing economic activities and increasing social and political oppression, Greece forced Turkish minority to migrations.[545] Similarly many Greeks who lived in İstanbul were exposed to the same oppressions during 6-7 September in 1955. On both sides, innocent people paid the penalty for the nationalist policies of Turkish and Greek governments.

Since there was no security of life and property, Turkish villages were abandoned in western Thrace.[546] At certain intervals, there were small groups of Turkish refugees who fled to Turkey in the 1950s. Some of them settled in Edirne. According to the population census of 1960, the population of Edirne province was around 275,000. However, 190,000 out of that number were living in rural

[541] "Batı Trakya'daki Irkdaşlarımız Çok Fena Durumdalar," *Edirne Postası,* 18 December1946.

[542] "Çeteciler Yurdumuza Yakın Yunan Köylerine Taaruza Başladılar," *Edirne Postası*, 21 June1947.

[543] "Batı Trakya 'da Türk Köylerinin Tasfiyesi," *Vatandaş Gazetesi,* 29 April 1957

[544] "Yunanistan Türk Azınlığı Baskı Altında Cemaat Seçimleri Yaptı" *Edirne Postası,* 25 May 1957.

[545] "Trakya Türklerine Baskı Artıyor" *Vatandaş Gazetesi,* 12 July 1957.

[546] "Batı Trakya'da Yunan Baskısı Tahammül Edilemez Bir Hal Aldı," *Edirne Postası,* 8 August1957

areas.[547]While the population growth rate was 15 percent in the average of Turkey, it was 10 percent in Edirne province from 1955 to 1960.

Cultivated Lands in Edirne Province in the 1950s

Thanks to the disappearance of the war threat, the land distribution policy of the government and agricultural mechanization the area of cultivated lands began to increase in Edirne. Moreover, with the increase of agricultural productivity, peasants made profit money. The richer they became, the more they wanted to cultivate. Similarly, they were interested in using agricultural machines more and more. For example, while the total cultivation area was 1,900,000 dönüms at the beginning of the 1950s,[548] the cultivation area reached almost 2,350,000 dönüms in1955 in Edirne province.[549] From 1950 to 1955, while the cultivation area was increasing 50 percent on the average in Turkey,[550] it increased only 25 percent in Edirne province.[551]Finally when it comes to 1960, the cultivation areas in Edirne province reached almost 2,900,000 dönüms.[552]

In additions, on the average, every village had around 10,000 dönüms of cultivated lands in 1960. While the size of cultivated lands was expanding, the size of swamplands, meadows and pasture lands decreased. Similarly, from 1939 to 1960, the size of cultivated lands increased nearly two times in Edirne. Although the

[547] Republic of Turkey, *General Census (1960)* (Ankara: Devlet İstatistik Enstitüsü Matbaası, 1963), p. 21.

[548] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1946-1954)* p. 72.

[549] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1954-1958)* (Ankara: Prime Ministry, 1959), p. 76.

[550] Republic of Turkey, *The Summary of Agricultural Statistics (1939-1959),* pp. 4-6.

[551] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1954-1958),* p. 76.

[552] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1959-1961)* (Ankara: Devlet İstatistik Enstitüsü Matbaası, 1963), p. 39.

population of Edirne province decreased during WWII, on the average, it was around 250,000 in the 1950s. On the average, the number of peasant family was around 30,000 presumably. On the average, every peasant had between 80 and 100 dönüm lands in Edirne province.

Scientific Observation of Cultivated Lands and Land Distribution Policy

Russell Dorr, who was the president of the Marshall Plan Administration for Turkey, said that it was important to get information about how the cultivable lands were being used and where the agricultural products and animals were being grown in Turkey.[553] Therefore, Agricultural Census was decided to be conducted by Marshall Plan Administration for Turkey and General Statistical Office in Turkey. Thanks to this census of 1950 allows us to observe the agricultural geography scientifically. In addition, agricultural census was necessary for preparing agricultural development projects, increasing the welfare levels of peasants and learning about the agricultural production of Turkey. [554] Within the scope of the Marshall Plan, Turkey had integrated to the international markets with the export of agricultural products (between 1948 and 1954) and the DP government also decided to investigate the lands scientifically. As a result of the research of the Agricultural Faculty of Ankara University, agriculturalists came to a conclusion about the influence of chemical manure and irrigation on agricultural productivity.[555] In order to increase agricultural production, agricultural productivity, and teach technical information to peasants agricultural coordination working that was consisting of

[553] "Marshall Planı Türkiye İdresi Başkanı Russel Dorr Diyor ki," *Edirne Postası*,16 December 1950.

[554] "Türkiye'de Tarım Sayımı ve Hedefi," *Edirne Postası,* 18 October 1950

[555] "Türkiye'de Toprağın İlk İlmi Etüdü," *Edirne Postası* ,31 June1953.

lieutenant governor, agriculturalists, veterinarians and also on were visiting villages.[556]

The Land Reform was debated in the Turkish Grand National Assembly in 1945. However, the Land distribution policy was enforced intensively during the 1950s. The number of families who received lands was around 322,000 during the 1950s.[557] Also 23,540 out of these families were refugee families most of whom had come from Greece and Bulgaria during the 1950s. Land Distribution was enforced in 4085 villages of Turkey. Across Turkey, around 16,000,000 dönüms lands were distributed and also around 1,200,000 dönüms of these lands were distributed to immigrant families during the 1950s. The government distributed these lands for loan value.[558]

In addition to agricultural mechanization and being landless peasants, the refugee from Bulgaria and Greece increased cultivated the amount of cultivated lands in Edirne province. Between the period between 1950 and 1955 which coincided with the influx of Turks from Bulgaria almost 450,000 dönüms lands were distributed to peasants.[559] Similarly some of these lands were distributed to immigrants in Edirne province. The land distribution commission that had worked in Edirne for a while, first, decided to distribute some public lands to peasants in the villages of Ahi, Uzgaç, Büyükdoğanca, Elçili, Demirhanlı and Sırpdındığı (Sarayakpınar). They were expected to apply to the commission with a written

[556] "Zirai Koordinasyon Çalışmaları" *Edirne Postası*, 23 June1954.

[557]Republic of Turkey, *Annual Statistics (1959)* (Ankara: Prime Ministry, 1961), p. 250.

[558] Republic of Turkey, *Annual Statistics (1959),* p. 250.

[559] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1954-1958),* p.76.

statement in ten days. [560] The aim of government was to increase agricultural productivity and profit.[561]

Within the scope of land distribution, around 300,000 dönüms were distributed to the peasants in Edirne in 1950. The aim of the government was to distribute around one million dönüms lands before 1955 in that province.[562] Within the scope of *Toprak Bayramı* (land festivals) 10,500 dönüms were distributed to nearly 420 peasant families in the villages of İskender, Demirhanlı, Sazlıdere, Yolageldi and Kayapa.[563] The issue of land distributon was dealt with in the local DP congress. For example, in the Uzunköprü DP congress, the DP representatives complained that land commissions were so slow and they had to move more quickly.[564]

Similarly, the DP delegates of Hıdırağa Village and Habiller Village said that vacant lands and public lands had to be distributed to the landless peasants. Thus, both agricultural production and the welfare level of the peasants could be improved. Across Turkey, there were nearly seventy land distribution commissions and in order to speed up the process of land distribution, their number increased.[565] Specific to Edirne, 52 numbered land commissions in Uzunköprü distributed almost 180,000 dönüms. Similarly, 53 numbered land commissions in Keşan distributed around 2600 dönüm lands to 100 peasant families in Aziziye village.[566] Within the work of 15 numbered land commissions in Edirne province, almost 25,000 dönüms lands and

[560] "Çiftçiye Toprak Dağıtılıyor," *Edirne Postası*, 7 July1948.

[561] *Edirne Postası,* 31 June 1953.

[562] "Köylüye Toprak " *Yeni Edirne Gazetesi,* 21 August 1950.

[563]"418 Aileye 10.511 Dönüm Toprak Dağıtıldı," *Yeni Edirne*, 16 June 1951.

[564] "Uzunköprü Demokrat Parti Merkez İlçesi Dilekleri," *Yeni Edirne Gazetesi,* 25 April 1952.

[565] "Topraksız Köylüye Üç Milyon Dekar Toprak Dağıtılacak," *Edirne Postası,* 22 December 1954.

[566] "Keşan'da Toprak Dağıtımı," *Edirne Postası,* 16 July 1955

20,000 dönüms of meadows were distributed to peasants in some villages of Havsa, İpsala and Lalapaşa in 1955.[567]

Within the scope of the protection of private property, government decided to issue mapped title deeds. Thus it tried to prevent the misappropriation of the lands of orphans and people who lived in urban areas but had fields in their villages.[568] In the same way, in these years, if farmers who were doing their military service applied, the government would distribute lands to them.[569] The price of lands was around thirteen million liras.[570]

In 1957, a land distribution regulation came into force, according to this regulation there would not be landless peasants. The government distributed lands to peasants who work in the fields of others through sharecropping and land tenure agreement.[571] The land commission in Uzunköprü ended technical measurement and started land distribution. Almost 4000 dönüms of land were distributed to peasants and almost 800 dönüms of land were determined as meadow in Hamidiye village in Uzunköprü. [572] In order to indicate the susceptibility of government in relation to land distribution, lieutenant governor Yusuf Acar went to Küçükdoğanca and Kocahıdır villages of İpsala to deliver the title deeds of the peasants.[573] To ensure private ownership, title deeds had importance. For example, in the local congress of the Democrat Party, the DP delegate of Hasköy complained that although 70

[567] "Vilayetimizde Bu Yıl Dağıtılan Toprak ve Mera," *İpsala Gazetesi,* 10 December 1955

[568] "Köy Topraklarına Ait Bir Açıklama," *Edirne Postas,ı* 6 May 1954.

[569] "Askerde Olan Çiftçiye de Toprak Verilecek," *Edirne Postası,* 14 December 1954.

[570] "Uzunköprü'de Toprak Dağıtımı," *Edirne Postası,* 4 August 1955

[571] "Çiftçiyi Topraklandırma Nizamnamesi Yürürlüğe Girdi," *Edirne Postası,* 29 March1957.

[572] "Uzunköprü 'de Muhtaç Çiftçiye Toprak Dağıtımı Devam Ediyor," *Edirne Postası,* 29 September 1957.

[573]"İpsala'da Toprak Dağıtımı," *Hizmet Gazetesi,* 1 January1959

peasants in Hasköy had received lands in 1944, they had not received their title deeds yet.[574]

The Ranges of Agricultural Product

During the 1950s, the agricultural products cultivated in Edirne were cereals, industrial crops, legumes and horticultural crops. To some extent the crop preferences of the peasants cannot be thought as independent from climate conditions, labor force and government policies such as price policy and credit policy. However with agricultural mechanization and a sufficient number of labors, there was no great labor force problem as much as it was in the 1940s. While the crops that did not require too much work and grow in a short period of time had been preferred during the war period, people mainly took into account the price level of agricultural products in the 1950s.

The production of Cereals

Similar to the average of Turkey, cereals constituted almost 80 percent of the cultivated lands in Edirne. As cultivated lands expanded during the 1950s, the cultivation area and the production of cereals increased steadily in Edirne province. For example around 1,600,000 dönüms out of 1,900,000 dönüms were cereals in Edirne in 1951.[575] In the 1950s, almost 2,000,000 dönüms out of 2,500,000 dönüms lands was cereal. Also average annual cereal production was around 220,000 tons. However, finally in 1960, the cultivation area of cereals was 2,200,000 out of

[574] "Havsalıların Dilekleri," *Yeni Edirne Gazetesi*, 18 December 1951.

[575] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1946-1954),* p. 72.

2,900,000 dönüms and the annual cereal production reached to almost 240,000 tons.[576] As main cereal crops, the cultivations of wheat, rye, barley, corn and rice could be indicated during the1950s. Across Turkey, the cultivation areas of cereal crops increased from 80,000,000 dönüms to 140,000,000 dönüms during the first half of the 1950s.[577] However, it remained at the same levels until 1960. It is possible to see the same case in Edirne province. In other words, although the cultivation area of cereal crops increased steadily, the increasing rate of cereal cultivation decreased after 1955 in Edirne province. This was closely related to a decrease in exports.

Russell Dorr said that the wheat that had increased as a result of economic program would help to feed the military troops of free world and the workers of their defense industry.[578] Since wheat was a high nutritional value food, it was mostly consumed as bread. Within the scope of the Marshall Plan which aimed at agriculture based development in Turkey, the DP used most of the foreign funds in the development of agriculture. In addition to agricultural credit supports, government implemented a price support policy in wheat. Furthermore, while the average of one kilogram wheat prices was 23 kuruş in the USA it was 30 kuruş in Turkey.[579] Moreover, due to high wheat prices, many peasants especially engaged in wheat cultivation until the mid- 1950s.[580]

Within the scope of the export policy, wheat had the highest production among cereal crops both in Edirne and throughout Turkey. However, while 60

[576] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1954-1958),* p. 76.

[577]Republic of Turkey, *The Summary of Agricultural Statistics (1939-1959),* p. 4.

[578] Varlı and Suat Oktar, p. 10.

[579] Ibid., p. 13.

[580] Republic of Turkey, *Bitkisel Üretim Miktarları, Üretici Fiyatları ve Girdiler (1948-1974),* pp. 20-23.

percent of the cereal cultivation areas were wheat in the average of Turkey;[581] nearly half of the cultivation areas of cereal were wheat in Edirne province.[582] Since the price of wheat was 10 or 15 kuruş more expensive than barley and rye, peasants started to cultivate more wheat.[583] Similar to the average of Turkey, the cultivation areas of barley were one third that of wheat in Edirne.[584] While the cultivation area of wheat was 400,000 dönüms and annual wheat production was 33,000 tons in 1948,[585] it reached to 1,000,000 dönüms of cultivation area and the annual wheat production was nearly 120,000 tons in 1960 in Edirne.[586] As was mentioned before, similar to the average of Turkey, the cultivation area of wheat increased two times from 1948 to 1955. By the same token, the increasing rate of wheat cultivation area decreased between 1955 and 1960. While the cultivation areas increased two and a half times, agricultural productivity increased almost four times. No doubt, agricultural mechanization, the use of pesticides and manure were influential in yield.

The difference in the cultivation area of wheat between the average of Turkey and Edirne resulted from the large cultivation area of corn and rye in Edirne. While the cultivation area of corn and rye constituted around 10 percent of total cultivation area of cereals in the average of Turkey,[587] the cultivation area of these two cereals had between 25 and 30 percent in total cultivation areas of cereals in Edirne province during the 1950s. For example the average annual production of corn was 25,000

[581] Republic of Turkey, *The Summary of Agricultural Statistics (1939-1959),* p. 4.

[582]Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1954-1958),* p. 76.

[583] Republic of Turkey, *Bitkisel Üretim Miktarları, Üretici Fiyatları ve Girdiler (1948-1974),* pp. 20-23.

[584] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1954-1958),* p. 76.

[585] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1946-1954),* p. 72.

[586] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1954-1958),* p. 39.

[587] Republic of Turkey, *The Summary of Agricultural Statistics (1939-1959),* p. 4.

tons and the average cultivation areas of corn was around 250,000 dönüms in Edirne during the1950s. [588] Even though the cultivation of corn was not life sustaining as much as it had been in the1940s, peasants cultivated corn in their irrigable lands. With the decreasing amount of meadows, corn was mainly used to feed their animals. Most probably, some of these corns were exported to international markets during the Korean War. Therefore, similar to wheat, one of the reasons for the fluctuations in the cultivation area of corn resulted from foreign demand and the end of the Korean War. People could consume corn as flour, oil or pop corn.

Similar to the average of Turkey, in Edirne province the cultivation area of corn increased until the mid -1950s,[589] and then it decreased in 1960.[590] Furthermore, the cultivation area of corn decreased in 1960 more than that of 1950 in Edirne. Even though the price of corn increased two times from 20 kuruş to 40 kuruş after 1956, corn production decreased in Edirne. The second reason for the decline in corn production was closely related to the crop preference of peasants. Many peasants preferred to cultivate sunflowers which were more expensive than corn.[591]

Rye was being used to make bread and to make fodder. While the cultivation area of rye was only one- fourth of the cultivation area of barley in the average of Turkey,[592] the cultivation areas of rye and barley were very close to each other in Edirne. Due to the continental climate of Thrace, rye was a more suitable crop in Edirne during the 1950s. For example, the average annual rye production was around 30,000 tons and the average annual cultivation area of rye was nearly 300,000

[588] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1954-1958),* p. 76.

[589] Ibid., p. 76.

[590] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1959-1961),* p. 39.

[591] Republic of Turkey, *Bitkisel Üretim Miktarları, Üretici Fiyatları ve Girdiler (1948-1974),* pp. 20-23.

[592]Republic of Turkey, *The Summary of Agricultural Statistics (1939-1959),* p. 4.

dönüms in Edirne.[593]In addition, the price of one kilogram rye was around 20 kuruş in the first half of the 1950s and its price rose to 25- 30 kuruş in the second half of the 1950s [594]

The cultivation areas of rye and corn started to decrease in late 1950s. This could also be explained through the decrease in the livestock in Edirne from 930,000 animals[595]to 775,000.[596] Before the 1950s, there had been large areas of pasture lands and meadows suitable for cattle, sheep, and goats farming. However, with the agricultural mechanization and land distribution to peasants and new immigrants, the size of pasture lands had decreased. [597] Thus, some peasants gave up animal husbandry or they decreased the number of their animals. In order to increase the number of animals, the Agricultural Ministry sent 85 rams, one hundred male goats and 30 lambs to the villages of Süloğlu.[598]

The cultivation area of rice paralleled the expansion of cultivated lands on the Ergene and Maritsa Plains. Most of the rice production was supplied from İpsala, Meriç, and Uzunköprü. Although its cultivation area and production amount changed year by year, the average cultivation area of rice was 60,000 dönüm and the average production amount was 12,000 tons during the 1950s.[599]However, with the increase of rice prices from nearly 50 kuruş to nearly100 kuruş, the cultivation area of rice doubled in 1957.[600] On the average, peasants were obtaining around 200 kilogram of

[593] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1954-1958),* p.76.

[594] Republic of Turkey, *Bitkisel Üretim Miktarları, Üretici Fiyatları ve Girdiler (1948-1974),*pp.20-23.

[595] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1946-1954),* p. 72.

[596] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1959-1961),* p. 39.

[597]Republic of Turkey, *Edirne Ticaret ve Sanayi Odası Rehberi*, p. 67.

[598] "Vilayetimizde Hayvancılık Çalışmaları," *Hizmet Gazetesi*, 4 May 1959.

[599]Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1954-1958),* p. 76.

[600] Republic of Turkey, *Bitkisel Üretim Miktarları, Üretici Fiyatları ve Girdiler (1948-1974),*pp. 20-23.

rice per each dönüm.[601]With the suitable weather conditions, more cultivated lands notably in the villages of İpsala, Meriç, Uzunköprü and Edirne were opened to rice cultivation.[602] For example, while the cultivation area of rice was around 60,000 dönüms in 1953,[603] it increased to130, 000 dönüms in 1958.[604] Although agricultural mechanization increased, in general combine harvesters and tractors were not entering in paddy fields until the beginning of the 1990s. Therefore, labor force in rice cultivation and harvest was quite necessary.

Due to the surplus of rice production, the government decided to export rice.[605] Due to new methods in rice production, such as the use of chemical manures and pesticides, DP government prepared new law draft about rice cultivation in 1955.[606] Due to the existence of irrigable plains and the rising rice prices, the production of rice increased in Thrace. Rice cultivation also required institutionalization in villages. Peasants established cooperatives and made decisions about rice cultivation areas based on the danger of malaria and the water capacity of rivers. Similarly, Thrace Rice Commissions held a conference to discuss the water capacity of rivers and the cultivation areas of rice.[607] Their decisions determined the size of cultivation area.

---

[601]Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1954-1958),* p. 76.

[602] "Çeltik Ekimi," *Edirne Postası,* 10 May 1957.

[603] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1954-1958),* p. 76.

[604] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1959-1961),* p. 39.

[605] "1954 Mahsulü," *Edirne Postası,* 6 January1955.

[606] "Çeltik Ekimi için Hazırlanan Tasarı Büyük Millet Meclisi Encümenlerince Müzkerelerine Başlandı," *Edirne Postası,* 9 February 1955.

[607] *Edirne Postası,* 26 February1957.

Legume Cultivation in Edirne

When it comes to legumes, similar to the average of Turkey, legume had the least cultivation area and production amount in agricultural products. For example, the cultivation areas of legume were between 40,000 and 50,000 dönüms of lands in Edirne province. On the average, annual legume production was around 3000 and 4000 tons during the 1950s. [608] Similar to average of Turkey, bean and bitter vetch had the largest cultivation area in Edirne. Since bean could be grown in three or four months, its cultivation was practical. From 1948 to 1960, on the average, the cultivation of bean was 20,000 dönüm and also annual bean production was around 1500 tons.[609] With the increase of cultivated lands, legume production increased two times in 1960.[610] Beans were a high nutritional value food. While the price one kilogram of bean was 30 kuruş in 1950, it increased five times by the end of 1950s.[611] Apart from bean fields, since they could irrigate their beans quite easily many sowed beans along the borders of paddy fields. Therefore, with the increase of rice agriculture, bean production also increased.

Bitter vetch was an important fodder crops. Due to its short growth time and easy cultivation, its cultivation area was large. However on the average, the cultivation area of bitter vetch was around 10,000 dönüms and annual production was around 1000 tons until 1958.[612] But the cultivation area and the production of

[608] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1954-1958),* p. 76.

[609] Ibid., p. 76.

[610] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1959-1961),* p. 39.

[611] Republic of Turkey, *Bitkisel Üretim Miktarları, Üretici Fiyatları ve Girdiler (1948-1974)*,pp. 20-23.

[612]Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1954-1958),* p. 76.

bitter vetch decreased by half in 1960 in Edirne province.[613] There was a decrease in the cultivation area of bitter vetch after 1958 across Turkey but in this decrease was occurred suddenly in Edirne province. While the cultivation area of bean was two times greater than that of bitter vetch in Edirne, their cultivation areas was close to each other in the average of Turkey. [614] Instead of bitter vetch, peasants preferred bean and chickpea cultivation.[615] For example, Kırkavak Village of Uzunköprü was famous for its legume cultivation. Many peasants in Kırkavak were taking their legumes and fruits to sell the marketplace in Uzunköprü on every Thursday.

The Cultivation of Industrial Crops

While cotton, tobacco and potato were among the prominent industrial crops in the average of Turkey, sunflower, sesame and sugar beet were the most common industrial crops in Edirne province during the 1950s. Furthermore, while around half of the cultivation areas of industrial crops were sesame in Edirne between 1948 and 1958,[616] half of the cultivation areas of industrial crops were cotton on average, in the rest of the country.[617] Between 1948 and 1958, the annual cultivation area of industrial crops was 200,000 dönüms in Edirne.[618] However, with the cultivation of sunflower, it increased to 450,000 dönüms between 1958 and 1960.[619]

[613]Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1959-1961),* p. 39.

[614] Republic of Turkey, *The Summary of Agricultural Statistics (1939-1959),* p. 5.

[615] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1954-1958),* p. 76.

[616] Ibid., p. 76.

[617]Republic of Turkey, *The Summary of Agricultural Statistics (1939-1959),* p. 6.

[618] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1954-1958),* p. 76.

[619] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1959-1961),* p. 39.

Due to climate conditions, the local peasants preferred the cultivation of sesame to cotton. Sesame was more luxury crop and required a larger labor force; therefore its production had decreased in the 1940s. However, in the 1950s, peasants started to cultivate sesame. The cultivation areas of sesame were around 100,000 dönüms and the average annual sesame production was 4500 tons between 1948 and 1958 in Edirne.[620] In addition to the four months growth process and climate conditions, the high prices of sesame made its cultivation more attractive. For example while the price of one kilogram sesame was 70 kuruş at the beginning of the 1950s, it increased to almost 200 kuruş by the end of the 1950s.[621] Many people used sesame oil in their homes. After the harvest of sesame, peasants were selling their crops to Uzunköprü Sesame Oil Factory.

Sesame was more expensive than cotton.[622] In some years, due to the floods of Maritsa and Ergene Rivers and continental climates of Thrace, peasants were unable to prepare their lands to cotton. The cultivation of cotton in Edirne was quite lower than the average of Turkey. Many peasants planted cotton apart from the Maritsa Plain, but due to poor irrigation, they could not get high productivity. On the average, the annual cultivation area of cotton was around 10,000 dönüms and its production was around 300 tons in the first half of the 1950s,[623] in the second half of the 1950s the annual cultivation area of cotton decreased to 2500 dönüms and its

[620] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1954-1958),* p. 76.

[621] Republic of Turkey, *Bitkisel Üretim Miktarları, Üretici Fiyatları ve Girdiler (1948-1974),* pp. 20-23.

[622] Ibid., pp. 20-23.

[623]Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1946-1954),* p. 72.

annual production was 120 tons.[624] While the price of cotton was 60 kuruş in 1948, it increased to 180 kuruş in 1960[625].

The cultivation area of sugar beet was around 60,000 dönüms and the average annual sugar beet production was around 65,000 tons between 1948 and 1958 in Edirne.[626]Due to drought, almost 30 percent of the sugar beets remained in the fields in the villages of Uzunköprü in 1949.[627] Thanks to pesticides, the peasants could struggle against insects.[628] Even though the transportation facilities, labor force, and mechanization increased during the 1950s, sugar beet cultivation did not increase to more than 60,000 dönüms.[629] This was related to the lower price of sugar beet and the cost of transportation.[630] For example, one kilogram of sugar beet was six kuruş at the beginning of 1950s and twelve kuruş in the end of 1950s.[631]

The cultivation of sugar beet formed to the networks of railways. As was mentioned before, sugar beet was transported to the Alpullu Sugar Plant by trains. Therefore, sugar beet cultivation was done in some villages of Uzunköprü, Havsa, and Edirne. Sometimes sugar beet transportation to the Alpullu Sugar Plant and the watermelons transportation to other cities might have been coincided. Therefore, water melons that were stocked in Uzunköprü railway station may have spoiled due to lack of sufficient number of wagons. [632]

---

[624]Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1959-1961),* p. 39.

[625] Republic of Turkey, *Bitkisel Üretim Miktarları, Üretici Fiyatları ve Girdiler (1948-1974),* pp. 20-23.

[626] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1946-1954),* p. 72.

[627] "Uzunköprü'den Haberler," *Edirne Postası,* 24 December 1949.

[628] "Bu Yıl Mahsulümüz Çok Bereketli Olacak," *Edirne Postası,* 31 May1955.

[629] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1954-1958),* p.76.

[630] "Edirne'nin Kalkınması" *Edirne Postası,* 28 December 1949.

[631] Republic of Turkey, *Bitkisel Üretim Miktarları, Üretici Fiyatları ve Girdiler (1948-1974),* pp. 20-23.

[632] "Karpuz, Kavun Çok Bol," *Edirne Postası,* 8 August 1955.

With the migrations from Western Thrace and Bulgaria, Turkish immigrants introduced sunflowers to Edirne. Owing to the floods of Maritsa River, mulberry trees were damaged, and peasants started to give up silkworm breeding. They moved toward the cultivation of crops that had high income. The climate condition of Thrace was suitable for sunflower cultivation. It was suitable for crop rotation with wheat. Since wheat had hairy root and sunflower had taproot, sunflower could benefit from the minerals that was situated in deep seated. Sunflowers required workers and the use of agricultural machines. Therefore, it was a suitable agricultural crop for the mechanization of the 1950s. Similar to corn, it was used to make oil and fed to the livestock.

From 1958 onwards the cultivation of sunflower increased remarkably. The annual cultivation area of sunflower was around 250,000 dönüms and its annual production amount was 20,000 tons between 1958 and 1960.[633] Many rice growers started to cultivate sunflower due to its low cost and high yield.[634] Similarly, One kilogram of sun flower was around 75 kuruş between 1958 and 1960.[635] With the cultivation of sunflower, the cultivation area of industrial crops doubled. Since newly cultivated lands had been created through the land distribution policy and mechanization, the expansion in the cultivation areas of industrial crops did not led any decrease in cereal or legume cultivation. Moreover, the cultivation areas of cereals and legumes increased.[636] Sun flower could be grown in four months and thanks to its pollen and nectar, the increased in Thrace. For example while there were

[633] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1959-1961),* p. 39.

[634] "Çeltik Ziraatımız Dörtte Üç Nispetinde Azalmaya Maruzdur," *Yeni Edirne Gazetesi*, 18 April 1955.

[635]Republic of Turkey, *Bitkisel Üretim Miktarları, Üretici Fiyatları ve Girdiler (1948-1974),* pp. 20-23.

[636] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1959-1961),* p. 39.

almost 17,000 bee hives[637] in 1956, the number increased to almost 20,000 in 1960.[638] Similarly, honey production increased from 140 tons[639] to 260 tons between 1957 and 1960.[640]

Government Investment in the Agriculture of Edirne Province

Waterworks in Edirne: Artesian sources and the Reclamation of Maritsa River

In order to increase the amount of cultivated lands and agricultural productivity, to meet potable water requirement of household and to prevent malaria and floods, the government declared a project to reclaim the Maritsa River and drill some artesian wells. [641] The geographical land forms of Edirne were suitable for artesian springs. The Marshall Plan not only provided farmers with financial aid but also provided them with technical aid.[642] The Bank of Provinces funded the drilling artesian wells in Uzunköprü in 1948. Thus, five artesian wells could be drilled.[643] Thanks to artesian wells, both irrigation water requirements and potable water requirements were provided.

According to the statement of Edirne governor Turgut Başkaya, there would be no waterless village in 1957. The Ministry of Public Works sent 250,000 TL in

[637] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1954-1958)*, p. 76.

[638] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1959-1961),* p. 39.

[639] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1954-1958)*, p. 76.

[640] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1959-1961),* p. 39.

[641] "Ergene ve Meriç" *Edirne Postası*, 19 April 1950.

[642] "Türkiye'de Sıtma İle Mücadele Şiddetleniyor," *Edirne Postası,* 21 October 1950

[643] "Uzunköprü'nün Su İşi," *Edirne Postası,* 10 March 1948.

subsidies to Edirne. Furthermore, Başkaya formed a committee of three members who would visit villages and would prepare a report. It was expected that almost sixty villages would get potable water in 1957. [644] The project of potable waters continued in 1958. Some villages that got potable water were Hacıumur, Geçkinli, Süleymaniye, Rahmanca, Karahamza, Büyükdoğanca, Turpçular, Karlı, Hisarlı and Kocaali.[645]

Within the scope of the malaria control program, an expert team organized under the presidency of Dr. Frederick Kratz worked in cooperation with the Agricultural Ministry and the Health Ministry. Malaria decreased labor productivity in the agricultural sector and prevented the cultivation of rice. They decided to disinfect the area with DDT but they said that they would protect the paddy fields in the course of disinfection. [646] Also, some meetings about malaria control and rice cultivations were held with borough masters, agriculturalists, and the delegates of waterworks under the presidency of Edirne governor Emin Akıncı in the provincial assembly.[647] Two years later, common flies swarmed the villages of İpsala therefore, government made disinfected these areas with DDT.[648]

To prevent the flooding of the Maritsa River, reclaim new cultivated lands, irrigate more cultivated lands and increase agricultural production the government implemented the reclamation projects of the Maritsa River. [649] Almost 40,000

[644] "Bu Yıl İçme Suyuna Kavuşacak Olan Köylerimiz Tespit Ediliyor," *Vatandaş Gazetesi,* 12 March 1957

[645] "1958 Yılında İçme Suyuna Kavuşan Köylerimiz," *Hizmet Gazetesi*, 20 October 1958.

[646] "Türkiye'de Sıtma İle Mücadele Şiddetleniyor," *Edirne Postası,* 21 October 1950

[647] "Edirne'nin Zirai Kalkınması ve Çeltik Ziraati Hakkında Bazı Yeni Kararlar Alındı," *Edirne Postası,* 1 April 1953

[648] "Sineklerle Mücadele," *İpsala Gazetesi,* 8 June 1955.

[649] "Meriç ve Ergene Ovalarının Islahı," *Yeni Edirne Gazetesi,* 29 June 1952.

dönüms of cultivated lands were under irrigation in Edirne in 1950.[650] However, this was quite insufficient for the irrigation in agriculture. In 1955DP Edirne Deputy Rukneddin Nasuhioğlu who was former Minister of Justice and Minister of Internal Affairs explained the socio-economic damages of floods of the Maritsa, Ergene and Tunca Rivers in Edirne Province. Similarly Nasuhioğlu posed a question to Eskişehir Deputy Kemal Zeytinoğlu who was Minister of Public Works about when the reclamation of Maritsa River would begin. Zeytinoğlu said that the DP government had the US firm prepared a project for the reclamation of the Maritsa River. This project would be ready in two months. Government officials would negotiate this project with Greek government officials.[651]Within the scope of the Marshall Plan, international waterworks standing committee of three started to work on the reclamation of the Maritsa River.[652] Besides, Turkish and Greek engineers made a protocol and observation on the left side of the Maritsa River nearby Tatar village.[653] Seventy percent of the reclamation of the Maritsa River would be made by means of Marshall Plan and this project would be implemented with the association of Turkey and Greece. Thus almost 820,000 dönüms of cultivable lands in the Maritsa plain both in Turkey and in Greece would be reclaimed. [654] Similarly 3,200,000 dönüms of lands would be saved from floods. In the reclamation of Maritsa the River, 160,000 dollars would be allocated for engineering expenses from the Marshall Plan. [655]

[650] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Census Results (1950),* (Ankara: Prime Ministry,1956), p. 45

[651] Republic of Turkey, Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi Zabıt Ceridesi, term 10, session 1, vol.5, 2 February 1955.

[652] "Meriç Yatağı Islah Edilecek," *Edirne Postası,* 16 December 1950.

[653] "Meriç Nehri Yatağının Islahı," *Yeni Edirne Gazetesi*, 19 September 1950.

[654] *Edirne Postası,* 16 December 1950.

[655] "Trakya'da Meriç Nehri Mecrası Marshall Yardımı İle Tanzim Edilecek," *Edirne Postası,* 10 March 1951.

The reclamation of the Maritsa River would be implemented by the Harza Engineering Company in Chicago in the USA. Furthermore, this company sent 13 engineers to conduct a study over six months.[656] It opened offices in Edirne and Dedeağaç (Evros). In this team, director Davis, chief engineer Willey, soil specialist Ardner and water specialist Josedh came to Edirne. [657] However, in 1954, since Greece had spent the allotted funds on another project research, the examinations of engineers stopped temporarily.[658] Two years later, the tender of the Maritsa River project was contracted in the General Directorate of State Hydraulic Works and six different companies submitted tenders for the reclamation of the Maritsa River. Edip Aydın Company was awarded.[659] The Ministry of Public Works allocated nearly 30 million Turkish Liras for this project.[660]

Floods in 1954 reinforced the claim for the need to reclaim the Maritsa River. Thousands dönüms of cultivated land were submerged, many citizens became homeless and the main roads between Edirne and İstanbul were damaged.[661] The railway was damaged in Greece and for nearly 20 days, railway transportation stopped.[662] The Ergene and Maritsa plains were submerged. Peasants traveled to Uzunköprü and Pehlivanköy by boats.[663] Owing to floods, the Red Crescent sent two teams along with10, 000 Turkish Lira as financial support.[664] It was announced that

[656] Ibid., 10 March 1951.

[657] "Meriç Nehrinin Islah İşi Harza Engineering Kumpanyasına Devredildi," *Yeni Edirne Gazetesi,* 18 March 1952.

[658] "Suların Taşmasıyla Her Sene Büyük Zarar Açan Meriç Nehri Mecrasının Temizlenmesi İşi Ne Olacak," *Edirne Postası*, 17 May 1954.

[659];"Meriç Nehrinin Islah İşi, "*Yeni Edirne Gazetesi,* 18 April 1955.

[660] "Meriç Nehri'nin Yatağı Islah Ediliyor," *İpsala Gazetesi,* 18 April1955.

[661] "Sürekli Yağışlar Neticasinde Birçok Yeri Seller Bastı," *Edirne Postası,*17 December 1954.

[662] "Avrupa Trenleri Ancak Dünden İtibaren işletmeye Açılabildi," *Edirne Postası,* 28 January 1955.

[663] "Ergene Ovası Sular Altnda," *Edirne Postası*, 13 January 1955.

[664] "Su Baskınına Uğrayanlara Yardım Ediliyor," *Edirne Postası*, 26 January 1954.

Turkey and Greece would continue the reclamation of the Maritsa River next April.[665] However, it would be postponed until the end of May. To start the reclamation of Maritsa River, two sod –cutting ceremonies were held with the attended by the Ministers of Public Works of Turkey and Greece near Çakmak village in Turkey and near Pythio in Greece.[666]

According to the expectations of the engineers, the reclamation of the Maritsa continued five years. They started their work both from both sides of the river. One group of engineers worked in Edirne and the other worked in Enez. [667] The plan was to be completed for the first regions between Edirne and Enez in first year, Edirne and İpsala regions in the second year, Edirne Karaağaç in third year, Enez and İpsala regions in fourth years and finally Meriç and Küplü regions.[668]

However, the Maritsa River overflowed two years later again. As a result of snowmelt and excessive rain, the Ergene and Tunca rivers also overflowed and around 620,000 dönüms of cultivated land were submerged on 3 February 1956.[669] The Edirne governor general Bozkurt Kaplangı held a press conference, stating that although the building of barriers had not been finished, they could protect the Maritsa Plain from more serious floods.[670] By the same token, DP Edirne Deputies Rukneddin Nasuhioğlu and Mehmet Enginün made speeches in the Turkish Grand National Assembly about the floods of Maritsa River in 1956. They said that the

---

[665] "Meriç Nehri Yatağının Islahı ve Temizlenmesi Hususndaki Müzakereler Müsbet Neticelendi," *Edirne Postası,* 10 Ferbruary 1955.

[666] "Meriç ve Kollarının Temizleme ve Islahı Ameliyesine Yarın Başlanıyor," *Edirne Postası*, 31 May 1955.

[667] "Nehirlerin Temizlenmesi Yakında Başlıyor," *Edirne Postası*, 11 March 1955.

[668] "Meriç ve Tunca Nehirleri Yatağının Islah ve Temizlenmesi İşi için Hazırlıklara Başlandı," *Edirne Postası,* 23 March 1955.

[669] Genç, p. 54.

[670] "Seddeler Natamam Olmasına Rağmen İmtihanı Başarı İle Vermiş," *Edirne Postası,* 16 February1956

flood had rained 300 houses in the villages of Uzunköprü and İpsala. In addition thousand dönüms of fields had been submerged and the floods had brought a layer of sand that had decreased the productivity of soil. In contrast to Edirne governor, they did not think that the barriers along the Maritsa River could prevent floods. They declared that the reclamation of the Maritsa River had to be completed swiftly and immediate aid had to be sent to Edirne.[671]However, due to the insufficient number of machines and difficulties in expropriation, the reclamation of the Maritsa continued more slowly in 1956.[672]

Due to the reclamation of the Maritsa River, a border change was envisaged between Turkey and Greece.[673] However, the Cyprus issue, the pressures on the Turks in western Thrace and the 6-7 September Events against the Greeks in İstanbul started to be political problem between Turkey and Greece. Due to the floods of the Maritsa and being the members of NATO, the two countries continued associations in the reclamation of Maritsa River for a while, but the strained political environment was reflected the border changes. Some meadows of Tatar village along the Maritsa River had been decided to give Greece as a result of the agreement between Turkey and Greece. However the peasants of the village wanted to cut down some of the trees which they had planted before. When the people of Tatar Village went to plain, they were attacked by some Greeks. In the event, in which the gendarmes were involved, one Greek died. [674] The reclamation of the Maritsa River came to an end due to the disagreement between Turkey and Greece. Only barriers along the rivers

[671] Republic of Turkey, Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi Zabıt Ceridesi, term 10, session 2, vol. 10, 27 December 1956

[672] *Edirne Postası,* 16 February 1956.

[673] "Hudut Değişikliği Yapılması Zaruri Görülüyor," *Edirne Postası,* 29 January 1957.

[674] "Yunan Hududunda Vuku Bulan Haidsede Bir Yunanlı Öldü," *Edirne Postası,* 22 September1960.

were built in both sides. Although these barriers decreased the impact of floods, they were not enough to prevent more flooding.[675]

Highway Construction in Edirne Province in the 1950s

At the national level, the construction of highways was one of the main political aims of the DP government. In order to analyze and follow the process of main road construction, the Ministry of Public Works decided to invite 40 engineers who had 30 years of experience in the USA to Turkey.[676] It aimed to provide its citizens with economic development, educational and health services.[677] Since almost 80 percent of the population lived in villages, the construction of village roads would increase economic and social mobility. The existing road networks were the success of local administrators and the efforts of the peasants. However, poor organization, insufficient number of technical staff, financial difficulties, and difficulties in material procurement held up highway. [678]

In the construction of highways, seasonal weather conditions, the economic situations of towns and cities, and the types of vehicles that would be used on these routes were considered.[679] Highways were constructed in areas where there were high agricultural production, industrial production and raw materials. DP government aimed ninety kilometers of bridges and 23,000 kilometers of main roads across Turkey however the economic and technical aspects of Marshall Plan were not

[675] Genç, p. 50.

[676] *Edirne Postası,* 24 March1951.

[677] "Türkiye Yolları ve Planlı Çalışmalar, "*Edirne Postası,* 24 March 1951

[678] "Köy Yolları ve Finansmanı," *Vatandaş Gazetesi,* 15 December 1948.

[679] *Edirne Postası,* 24 March 1951.

sufficient to implement these political aims.[680] The DP government allocated 20 million for provincial and village highway construction in 1952.[681]

Road construction supported marketing facilities and socio-economic development of Edirne. Thanks to road construction, the agricultural products of Edirne were transported to both national and international markets. Opening to markets was one of the main economic aims of Marshall Plan. In addition to economic reasons, the government built highways to villages and towns that had flood hazards in Edirne, in order to be able to transport assistance more quickly. However, sometimes floods were so severe that these roads were submerged. Furthermore, road construction, vehicles, and the use of petroleum were increased. Due to its topography main road construction was quite easy in Edirne province. Similarly, since there was no any ravine and canyons, it did not require many workers or engineering works.

In Edirne province, in the 1950s, the length of state highways was nearly 200 km and half of these highways were rough road. In 1959, the length of state highways reached almost 240 km and there was no rough road. [682] Therefore, there was a 20 percent increase in the length of state roads in Edirne province. Across Turkey, the length of state highway increased from 24,000 km to 27,000 km during the 1950s. The length of rough road decreased from 11,000 km, to nearly 4000 km during the 1950s.[683]

Similarly, the length of provincial roads was nearly 180 km in 1950, but almost 130 km out of 180 km was rough road in Edirne province. In 1959, the length

[680] "Türkiye'de Yol Programının Muhtelif Cepheleri," *Edirne Postası,* 24 March 1951

[681] "Köy Yolları İnşaatı," *Yeni Edirne Gazetesi,* 4 April 1952.

[682]Republic of Turkey, *Annual Statistics (1959),* p. 455.

[683] Ibid., p. 459.

of provincial road reached to 360 km but one third of this road was rough roads in Edirne province.[684] Across Turkey, the length of provincial roads was 23,000 km and 18,500 km out of total length was rough road in 1950. Similarly, when it comes to 1959, it reached to nearly 34,000 km and 18,400 km out of total length was rough road. As a result, when compared to the average of Turkey, road repair, the new state highways and provincial road construction in Edirne were realized more quickly during the 1950s.[685]

In this sense, specific to Edirne province, it was declared to connect important centers. Therefore three main roads connections were planned. These main roads were Edirne -Lalapaşa, Keşan- İpsala, and Uzunköprü- Meriç main roads.[686] Firstly, they planned to connect all of the towns to Edirne. Since there was no railway track in Keşan and İpsala where there was high agricultural production, the peasants had to transport their products by means of the highways.

The roads between Hamidiye and Harmanlı villages in Uzunköprü not only connected eight villages to Uzunköprü but also served the transportation to ten brown coal fields. In the construction of these highways, the efforts of local peasants, the contribution of the Edirne governor Emin Akıncı and director of public works Vedat Beylikçi in Edirne were influential. Thanks to this main road, citizens could arrive to the brown coalfields easily and they did not use muddy roads.[687] Similarly, the main road between Demirhanlı- Pınarhisar had economic importance. Thanks to

[684] Ibid., p. 455.

[685] Ibid., p. 459.

[686] "Edirne'nin Her Bakımdan Kalkınması İçin Ne Gibi Esaslı Tedbirler Alınmış Bulunuyor," *Edirne Postası*, 25 June 1949.

[687] "Uzunköprü Hamidiye Harmanlı Yolu," *Yeni Edirne Gazetesi*, 9 October 1951.

this road, the coals from Demirhanlı would be transported easily to the cement plant in Pınarhisar. [688]

However, the floods of Maritsa, Egene and Tunca Rivers led to some damages to highways and railways in Edirne provinces. For example, as a result of floods one water outlet was demolished and therefore transportation halted in 1954.[689] The floods of these rivers prevented the socio-economic relations of Edirne province with other provinces. Since there was no main road in Enez, in case of floods in winter months, people were arriving to İpsala by boats.[690] Also, due to agricultural production capacity, İstanbul –Selanik main road would pass on Tekirdağ and İpsala.[691] Furthermore, İpsala Bridge was built on Maritsa River to pass Greece.[692]

Floods of the Maritsa River threatened the security of life and property in the villages of İpsala was in danger. They traveled by boats when there was flooding. Therefore, the government decided to build some bridges such as İbriktepe. [693] The main road between İpsala and İbriktepe was constructed in 1956, [694] and main road between Keşan and Enez was started to be built in 1957. The DP government allocated 1,200,000 TL for its building.[695] In order to speed up its construction, the

[688] "Edirne, Musabeyli, Demirhanlı, Hacıumur, Geçkinli, Süloğlu Yolu İnşaatı İlerliyor," *Vatandaş Gazetesi*, 14 May 1958.

[689] *Edirne Postası,* 17 December 1954.

[690] "Enez'in Bugünkü Çok Acıklı Hali," *Edirne Postası*, 24 December 1955.

[691] "İstanbul Selanik Yolu İnşaatına Devam," *Edirne Postası*, 27 April1956.

[692] "İstanbul Londra Asfalt Yolu İnşaatı Hızla İlerlemekte," *Edirne Postası,* 13 August 1956.

[693] "İpsala Ovasındaki Köprüler Yapılıyor," *Vatandaş Gazetesi*, 3 November 1948.

[694] "İpsala İbriktpe Yolu Yapılıyor," *İpsala Gazetesi,* 1 September 1956.

[695] "Enez Yoluna Başlanıyor," *Vatandaş Gazetesi*, 27 April 1957.

main road between Enez and Keşan was integrated to state highway.[696] Similarly main road between Küplü and Meriç was begun to be built.[697]

Although the government policies had importance in the construction of these roads, the views of local governors or prominent local politicians and citizens were being listened to and discussed in the local congress of the Democrat Party. Village delegates demanded the construction of main roads for their villages. For example, the DP delegate of Hacıdanışment village demanded the connection of his village to Lalapaşa.[698] Similarly, the DP delegate of Oğulpaşa demanded the connection of their village roads to the macadamized road between Edirne and İstanbul.[699]

While there were almost 200 vehicles such as cars, trucks and bus in 1950, the number increased to almost 500 in 1960 in Edirne.[700] Throughout Turkey, there were around 26,000 vehicles in 1950 which increased to around 95,000 in 1960. Therefore, on average, the number of vehicles that fell to each province was 400 in 1950 and nearly 1420 in 1960 throughout Turkey. Both the number of vehicles and their increasing rate were lower than national average in Edirne province during the 1950s.[701]In addition to cars, there were 952 tractors in 1952, this number reached around 1235 in 1960 in Edirne province. The average number of tractor in each province was around 625 nationally in 1960. The number of tractors in Edirne was twice as high as the national average. [702] In general, in addition to cultivation in fields, tractor with trailer was an important means of transportation for peasants

[696] "Enez Yolu da Devlet Yolu Oldu," *Hizmet Gazetesi,* 14 April 1959.

[697] "Meriç Küplü Yolu," *Vatandaş Gazetesi*, 29 April 1957.

[698] "Havsalıların Dilekleri," *Yeni Edirne Gazetesi,* 18 December 1951.

[699] "Lalapaşa'da DP Faaliyeti Arttı," *Yeni Edirne Gazetesi,* 15 February 1952

[700] Republic of Turkey, *Annual Statistics (1959),* p. 463.

[701] Ibid., p. 463.

[702]Republic of Turkey, *Tractor Survey Results, Agricultural Machinery and Equipments (1955-1959)* (Ankara: Ankara Basım ve Ciltevi, 1960), p. 11.

going to towns and cities during the 1950s. Thus social movement between rural and urban areas increased in Edirne.

Although main road construction continued, the railways maintained their importance in the transportations of passengers and goods. For centuries, Edirne and Thrace had been the food store of İstanbul. Therefore, the railway and main road transportation between İstanbul and Edirne had importance. From 1955 onwards, there were four motor train services each day between Edirne and İstanbul.[703]

Due to the Cyprus Problem and the increasing pressures on the Turkish minority in western Thrace and the 6-7 September Events in İstanbul, the political relations between Turkey and Greece became strained. This was reflected socio-economic lives of the local people in Edirne. Around 33 kilometers of railway track between İstanbul and Edirne passed through Greece territories. Since customs clearance and declarations of luggage in customs might have led to delays in the services of trains and a decrease in the number of passenger, the DP government decided to change the directions of railway track.[704] DP government decided to build railway track between Pehlivanköy and Edirne.[705] The railway track between Edirne and Pehlivanköy was to pass near Aslıhan village of Uzunköprü and continued to Edirne. Engineers came and started to make necessary preparations. Thus, Karaağaç Railway Station was thought as a transit station. Thus passage fee that was paid to Greece would be saved and Turkish passengers would travel more comfortably.[706] In this sense, the railway track between Edirne and İstanbul was made in Edirne without

[703] "Motorlu Trenlerin Tecrübesi Başladı," *Edirne Postası,* 4 August 1955

[704] "Yolcuların Gümrük Muayenesine Tabi Tutulmaları," *Edirne Postası*, 15 February1957

[705] "Tren Yolcularının Gümrük Muayeneleri Devam ediyor, "*Edirne Postası*, 26 February 1957

[706] "Pehlivan Köy Edirne Tren Hattı İçin Hazırlıklara Başlandı," *İpsala Gazetesi*, 3 October 1956.

passing from Greek territory. However, the construction of railway track between Edirne and Pehlivanköy could be completed in the beginnings of 1970s.

Agricultural Mechanization in Edirne Province during the 1950s

Keyder states that the import rate of agricultural machines increased from one percent to eight in the total import rate in Turkey.[707] While there were only 34 tractors in service during the 1940s,[708]there were 267 in 1950 and 950 in 1952,[709] and 1235 in 1959 in Edirne province.[710] There were around 31,000 tractors in 1952 [711]and 42,000 tractors in 1959 across Turkey; therefore, the number of tractors in Edirne province during the 1950s was two times higher than national average. In Edirne, most of these tractors needed kerosene and fuel oil to be run. One tractor belonged to Agricultural Cooperative, six of them belonged to the state and the rest were privately owned [712] Furthermore, sometimes two or more families were buying one common tractor. At least 80 percent of the tractors were seven years or older in 1959.[713] 1224 out of 1235 tractors were being used in Edirne province.[714]

There were around 30,000 tractor ploughs in Edirne province, with four tractors for each village in Edirne province. Therefore, many tractor owners ploughed the fields of other people for a fee. Some people still used wooden ploughs

[707] Keyder, *Dünya Ekonomisi içinde Türkiye,* p.180.

[708] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Equipments and Machinery Statistics (1940),* p. 11.

[709] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1946-1954)* p. 73.

[710] Republic of Turkey, *Annual Statistics (1959),* p. 242.

[711] Republic of Turkey, *Annual Statistics (1952)* (Ankara: Prime Ministry, 1953), p. 281.

[712] Republic of Turkey, *Tractor Survey Results, Agricultural Machinery and Equipments (1955-1959)* p. 9.

[713] Ibid., p. 243.

[714] Ibid., p. 10.

and draught animals such as oxen, cattle, and horses to cultivate their lands. There were around 20,000 wooden ploughs in Edirne province during the 1950s. [715] While there were almost 60,000 draught animals in Edirne in 1950,[716] there were 180,000 bovine animals such as cattle, oxen, horse and so on in 1960 in Edirne province. However, it should be emphasized that the increase in the number of these animals cannot be related only to cultivation. Almost 140,000 cattle were raised to benefit from their meat and milk. For example, almost 30,000 kilograms cow's milk was produced in 1960 in Edirne Province. [717] Therefore, apart from cows, the number of draught animals was 40,000. However, the number of sheep and goat decreased with the increase of cultivated lands. From 1954 to 1960, the number of goat and sheep decreased from 800,000[718] to 500,000.[719] Therefore, as was mentioned above, the number of total animals decreased in Edirne province.

Apart from paddy fields, due to the topography, combine harvesters could work in the cereal fields in Edirne province. There were 3222 combine harvesters at the beginning of the 1950.[720] Their number increased to nearly 5800 in 1959 across Turkey.[721] Therefore, while each province had an average 50 combine harvesters at the beginning of the 1950s, each province had 86 combine harvesters in 1959. While the number of combine harvester was 40 at the beginning of the 1950s,[722] this number increased to nearly 180 in 1959 in Edirne Province. The combine harvesters had different brands. 55 percent of combine harvesters in the country were Massey

[715]Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1954-1958),* p. 77.

[716] Republic of Tukey, *General Census (1950)* p. 45.

[717] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1959-1961),* p. 39.

[718] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1954-1958),* p. 77.

[719]Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1959-1961* p. 39.

[720] Republic of Turkey, *Annual Statistics (1952),* p. 281.

[721]Republic of Turkey, *Annual Statistics (1959),* p. 246.

[722] Republic of Tukey, *General Census (1950)* p. 45.

Harris and it was bought from the US, across Turkey. In Edirne, 95 percent of combine harvester brands were Allis Chalmers, Case, and Oliver and they were bought from the US. [723]

As was mentioned before, the *Selektör* (a seed cleaning machine) was important for the cleaning and disinfecting agricultural seeds. While there were nearly 420 selectors in 1948,[724] this number reached to around 1420 in 1959 in Turkey.[725] Edirne had 20 selectors during the 1950s.[726] The number of *selektör* (seed cleaning machine) in Edirne was close to the average of Turkey. These *selektörs* were situated in Edirne, Uzunköprü and Keşan. In order to obtain more qualified crops and to increase agricultural productivity, many peasants took their cereal seeds to *selektörs*.

Based on the Marshall Plan, the DP government encouraged peasants to buy agricultural machines, pesticides and chemical manure. Thus, they could cultivate more lands and they could increase agricultural productivity. This required institutionalization. The Agricultural Equipment Company that was founded in 1944 *(Zirai Donatım Kurumu)* and Agricultural Extension Service[727] introduced and encouraged the use of agricultural inputs such as pesticides, agricultural machines, and chemical manures by peasants.[728] Provided that they would comply with the rules of the government about the imports of agricultural machine, the Agricultural Ministry supported the firms that imported agricultural machines apart from the

[723]Republic of Turkey, *Annual Statistics (1959),* p. 246.

[724]Republic of Tukey, *General Census (1950),* p. 158.

[725] Republic of Turkey, *Tractor Survey Results, Agricultural Machinery and Equipments (1955-1959)* p. 11.

[726]Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1954-1958),* p. 77.

[727] "Köylere Hakikati Götürecek Olan Yayım Programının Tatbiki," *Edirne Postası,* 16 December 1950.

[728] "Çiftçiye Yardım," *Edirne Postası,* 2 June1948.

Marshall Plan from abroad. Besides, government also provided peasant with long term credit facilities. [729]

Agricultural machines were sold to peasant at price above. However, the cost of transportation and store were demanding.[730] Many peasants in Edirne province conveyed their wishes in the course of the village visits of Edirne Deputies. They demanded more agricultural machines from the Agricultural Ministry. [731] The tractor was being regarded as a machine that would provide peasants with agricultural productivity, increase the amount of cultivable lands and improve the socio-economic development of villages.[732]

Agricultural and Art Courses in Edirne Province

However, many young peasants needed to education in how to use agricultural machine and main and repair.[733] In order to use these machines for a longer time and to prevent from them becoming scrap as it had been in the 1930s, the government considered the spare parts and maintenance of agricultural machines.[734] Thus Agricultural Ministry opened 20 agricultural courses in different parts of the country.[735] The DP delegates complained about the lack of spare parts and enginemen in the DP Havsa Congress.[736] Namely, this was a dual process in which government and citizens had a voice.

---

[729] "Çiftçilere Kredi," *Edirne Postası*, 31 August 1950.

[730] "Çiftçiye Zirai Alet Verilecek," *Edirne Postası,* 19 February 1949.

[731] "Edirne Milletvekilleri Köyleri Gezdiler," *Edirne Postası,* 3 November 1948.

[732] *EdirnePostası* ,10 January 1951.

[733] "Tarımın Modernleşmesi," *Edirne Postası*, 10 March1951.

[734] "Ziraatin Planlı Makineleşmesi," *Edirne Postası,* 14 March 1951.

[735] "Tarım Bakanlığı Yirmi Kurs Açacak," *Yeni Edirne Gazetesi*, 4 March 1952.

[736] "DP İlçe Kongresi Dilekleri," *Yeni Edirne Gazetesi*, 25 April 1952.

An agricultural specialist who had received education in the US within the scope of the Marshall Plan administered the Turkish Agricultural Extension Services.[737] Government decided to open five months agricultural courses[738] and send both American and Turkish agricultural specialists to teach peasants in different parts of the country.[739] To be able to join these courses, males needed to be at least sixteen.[740] However, some agricultural teachers did not visit villages and teach peasants. For example, the DP delegates in Meriç complained that the agricultural teacher spent most of his time with clerking for the rice commission.[741]

Thanks to mechanization, mainly men were going to the fields. Many women spent more time at home. Therefore, agricultural mechanization both changed the lives of women and it led the government to open new courses. For them and young men, courses included needlecraft, weaving, and carpentry were opened. Generally these courses were opened by technical schools in the provinces. Many women both maintained their cultural values and prepared their dowries. Similarly, thanks to these courses, many young men acquired professions. At the end of two months program, with the opening statement of district governors and teachers, art works were exhibited by students in the building of course. [742]

While the cultivation areas of vineyards and fruit growing such as melon, water melon, apricot, peach and apple were almost 100,000 dönüms in the first half of the 1950s, it increased to 170,000 dönüms in the second half of the 1950s.[743] The

---

[737] Edirne *Postası*, 16 December 1950.

[738] *EdirnePostası,* 10 January 1951.

[739] *Edirne Postası,* 16 December 1950.

[740] *EdirnePostası,* 10 January 1951.

[741] "Meriç DP İlçe Kongresi Dilekleri," *Yeni Edirne Gazetesi*, 8 May 1954.

[742] "Kız ve Erkek Sanat Enstitülerine Bağlı Köy Kursları Sergileri Açıldı," *Edirne Postası,* 8 May 1954

[743] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1954-1958),* p. 76.

production of fruits increased from 60,000 tons[744] to 150,000 tons in this time period.[745] Especially, peasants engaged in watermelon farming in irrigated land such on the Maritsa and Ergene Plains in Edirne. In addition to the new cultivated lands, mechanization and sale cooperatives; the fruit growing courses increased both production and productivity. Thus the peasants of Edirne received education about fruit growing in Meriç town, İpsala town, Doyran village, Hıdırağa village and Karakasım village, Kırkavak village.[746]

With agricultural mechanization, the local peasants began to cultivate more lands. They could not waste time on silkworm breeding in Edirne province. Silkworm breeding started to decrease from an estimated 2500 silk worm boxes in 1950, to around 900 boxes in 1958. Since many peasants cut down their mulberry trees in Maritsa Plain, there were not sufficient numbers of mulberry trees.[747] Also they preferred other agricultural products such as rice, wheat and sunflower cultivation.

From1948 onwards, silkworm breeding fell into the background. There were no publications or the spread of silkworm breeding at the Silkworm Breeding Institutes.[748] Therefore, in order to prevent the decrease in silkworm, the government sent 1000 boxes of silkworm seeds to Thrace in 1950.[749] To encourage silkworm production and to prevent the victimization of peasants, at the meeting of Cocoon

[744] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1946-1954)* p. 72.

[745]Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1958-1960)* (Ankara: Prime Ministry, 1962), p. 39.

[746] "Meyvecilik Kursları Açıldı,"*Yeni Edirne Gazetesi*, 5 March 1954.

[747] "Temcit Pilavı," *Edirne Postası*, 21 January 1948.

[748] "Türkiye İpek Böcekçiliği Enstitüsünden Beklentilerimiz," *Edirne Postası,* 25 June 1949.

[749] "İpek Böcekçiliği Kursu" *Edirne Postası*, 19 April 1950.

Cooperatives of Edirne and Bursa, it was decided to talk to businessmen and determine suitable prices for silk.[750]

In this period, apiculture course was opened at the Edirne Silkworm Breeding Station. Those who graduated from the course were awarded diplomas.[751] With the increase of sunflower cultivation, apiculture developed in Edirne. For example the number of bee hive was around 10,000 at the beginning of the 1950s;[752] it increased doubled by the end of the 1950s.[753] The expenses of the agricultural courses were covered by Agricultural Ministry. The courses of agriculture, irrigation, fruit growing and veterinary medicine were opened in Edirne.[754]

The Credits of the Agricultural Bank and the Roles of the Cooperatives

The government encouraged agricultural mechanization, the use of pesticides and manure, and distributed agricultural seeds to the peasants who exposed to natural disaster. Thus government aimed to support peasant and to prevent their migration to the cities.[755] For example, due to drought in 1949, many peasants could not obtain agricultural production in the villages of central district Edirne. Therefore, the Agricultural Bank would send agricultural seeds and food. [756] Similarly, it decided to postpone the loans of these peasants. Seeds would be given by means of the

[750] "İpek Böcekçiliği ve Kozacılık Kalkındırılacak," *Yeni Edirne Gazetesi,* 7 July 1954.

[751] *Edirne Postası,* 19 April 1950.

[752]Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1946-1954),* p. 73.

[753]Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1954-1958),* p. 77.

[754] Köylerde Açılacak Halk Kursları," *Edirne Postası,* 30 March 1955.

[755] "Çiftçiye Yardım İçin Yeni Kanun Tasarısı," *Edirne Postası,* 10 July 1948.

[756] "Trakya'da Mahsul Umumiyetle İyidir," *Edirne Postası*, 10 August 1949.

Agricultural directorates.[757] The Agricultural Ministry sent almost 400 tons of seed to Kırklareli and Tekirdağ. These seeds were disinfected with Grannion pesticide against *sierme* diseases and it was provided by the Agricultural directorates. A sum of seed requirement of İstanbul was being provided from Edirne and these seeds were approved in 1950. [758]

The Agricultural Bank gave 250,000 TL credits to the İpsala Agricultural Credit Cooperatives which had 800 members and to the İbriktepe Agricultural Credit Cooperatives which had 500 members. Thanks to the Agricultural Credit Cooperatives, the peasants experienced how to be organized, how to be addressed in one meeting and how to be managed. In addition to gaining self confidence, the peasants had economic freedom before big landowners. Thus to some extent, the peasants obtained credits from the Agricultural Credit Cooperatives legally rather than big landowners. In terms of private ownership, the Agricultural Credit Cooperatives was important.[759]

Furthermore, 615 tons of wheat was sent from by the Soil Product Office to peasants who had suffered from droughts in Edirne between 1950 and 1955.[760] In order to transport agricultural seeds to the peasants on time, the Agricultural Ministry and the Soil Product Office cooperated. Around 50,000 tons of seeds were stocked in State Farms.[761]Thereupon, the government sent 6 tons of wheat seeds to Uzunköprü and 4 tons of wheat seed to Meriç in 1953.[762] Agricultural Banks was giving the

[757] "Edirne'nin Ekonomik ve Ticari Bakımdan Dert ve Dileklerini Tespit Etti," *Edirne Postası*, 24 August 1949.

[758] "Çiftçiye Tohumluk Veriliyor," *Edirne Postası,* 21 Ekim 1950.

[759] "Tarım Kredi Kooperatifleri İkrazata Başladı," *Vatandaş Gazetesi,* 3 November 1948.

[760] "Muhtaç Çiftçilerimize Tohumluk Yardımı," *Edirne Postası,* 17September 1955.

[761] "Köylüye Tohumluk Tevziatı Başlıyor," *Yeni Edirne Gazetesi,* 29 September 1950.

[762] "Uzunköprü'de Tohumluk Tevzi," *Yeni Edirne Gazetesi*, 20 March 1953.

highest credits for the last twenty five years.[763] To support cultivation, Agricultural Bank was providing peasants with loan especially in seed times.[764] However, according to Uzunköprü DP congress, delegates complained that despite these measures, many peasants could not buy seeds.[765]By the same token, in the DP congress of Meriç Town, DP delegates and DP administrative boards dealt with main road, marketing and land distribution. Notably, DP administrative board member of Rahmanca Village Osman Arslan and many delegates criticized their party and they said that small farmers could not benefit from the credit facilities of Marshall Plan.[766]

Similarly, the Thrace Rice Grower Association was founded in İpsala in 1950. The aims of association were to communicate with the government on the subject of rice cultivation and sanitary conditions. It was to take measures to drain swamplands and to regulate the cultivation area of rice. It was to protect the rights of workers and patrons on the subject of wages. It was to grow more qualified rice seeds and to aim to export surplus rice production. The association was to provide peasants with credits by means of banks. Finally, it was to defend the rights and the interests of its members before the government. The annual subscription fee of the association was 120 TL. Donations were also among the sources of its income. [767]

Joining the cooperative allowed the peasants to sell their product at affordable prices. Similar to the rice growers, sunflower growers tried to found a cooperative.[768] The Thrace Rice Commission conducted a meeting about water

[763] "Son Senelerde Zirai İstihsalimiz Makineleşti," *Edirne Postası*, 7 November1953.

[764] "Çiftçiye Kredi," *Edirne Postası*, 21 Aralık 1959.

[765] "Uzunköprü DP Ocak Kongreleri Hızla Devam Ediyor," *Edirne Postası*, 3February 1953.

[766] "Meriç DP İlçe Kongresi Yapıldı," *Edirne Postası,* 20 February 1953.

[767] "Trakya Çeltikçiler Derneği Kuruldu," Vatandaş Gazetesi, 29 September 1950.

[768] "Yeni Bir Kooperatif," *Edirne Postası*, 28 January 1955.

works and malaria in Lüleburgaz. They mainly discussed the water capacity of Ergene River, the cultivation area of rice, and the prevention of water waste.[769]

The Influence of Re-enactment of National Protection Law in 1956

Between 1948 and 1954, the socio-economic lives and welfare level of many peasants improved. They were able to buy some of their needs from marketplaces in towns such as radios, rubber shoes and clothes. They were able to produce more agricultural products and make more money. Compared to before, they could arrive to towns and cities more easily. They had survived the famine periods during WWII and achieved prosperity in the post- war period. The rise of the DP was a sort of hope to overcome their socio-economic backwardness. Since the DP helped Turkish immigrants from Balkans, this increased its political popularity in the eyes of many Thracians. The people of Edirne who had experienced war economy severely and thus supported the political changes and liberal economic policies of the DP from 1946 onwards. This political support continued strongly until 1960.

However, after the Korean War, there was a decrease in the export of agricultural products. An economic recession started to be felt after 1954. However, the government avoided interventionist economic policies. The foreign trade deficit that appeared as a result of free trade, and difficulties receiving foreign credits brought about the National Protection Law in 1956.[770] The sale of some goods was banned. Apart from the merchants, those who owned these products could not sell or

[769] *Edirne Postası,* 26 February 1957.

[770] Osman Cenk Kanca ,"1950-1960 Arası Türkiye'de Uygulanan Sosyo-ekonomik Politikalar," *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* 9, no.19 (2012), p. 59.

transport them.[771] In the end, the DP government accepted a stabilization program with the pressure of the International Monetary Fund (IMF).[772] The DP government that had come into power by criticizing government interventionism in the economy, applied to devaluation and price control in domestic and foreign trade in 1958.[773] Similarly, interest rates were increased and commercial bank credits were limited. The DP government passed into multiple currency practices until 1960. The 420 million dollars debt of Turkey were postponed and 395 million dollars in new credits were given to Turkey[774]

The National Protection Law of 1956 was felt in the socio-economic lives of Edirne. Some food needs such as tea, cafe, cheese, and meat could not be found easily. Similarly, people could buy only 200 grams of coffee per family with rationing cards that were distributed by the mukhtars.[775] Due to economic problems, the Sugar Plants delayed the peasants for the payment of sugar beets prices. Thereupon, sugar beet producers sent a telegram to the Prime Minister Adnan Menderes saying they had not received money from the Alpullu Sugar Plant for three months. They could not pay their debts to Agricultural Bank and they could not begin sugar beet cultivation which would begin two months later. [776] Despite the

[771] Beyanaata Tabi Mallar Ancak Vesikalara Dayanılarak Satılabilecek," *Edirne Postası,* 10 June 1955.

[772] Kanca ,"1950-1960 Arası Türkiye'de Uygulanan Sosyo-ekonomik Politikalar" p. 59.

[773] Gülten Kazgan ,*Tanzimattan 21. yy 'a Türkiye Ekonomisi*, 1st edition (İstanbul: Altın Kitaplar Yayınevi, 1999), p. 247.

[774] Gülten Kazgan , *Tanzimattan 21. yy'a Türkiye Ekonomisi*, p. 247.

[775] "Kahve Geldi," *Edirne Postası,* 24 December 1955.

[776] "Trakya'da Pancar Müstahsilleri Başvekile Müracaat Etti," *Vatandaş Gazetesi*, 1 January 1958.

legumes and fruits were grown in Edirne, their prices were high. This mainly resulted from the sale of the legumes and fruits to İstanbul.[777]

Similar to many inhabitants, the confectioners and ice cream sellers had difficulty in finding sugar.[778] After sugar began to be sold on the black market, the government decided to distributed sugar as half kilogram per capita with rationing cards. [779]After the DP government came into power, Menderes was claiming the prevention of the cost of living. However, the price of sugar did not go down for a while.[780] In order to solve the sugar scarcity, 24 tons of sugar was sent by the Alpullu Sugar Plant in 1955.[781] However, it was distributed to grocery stores and people could not buy much more than 700 gram of sugar.[782] The government also determined the price of sugar beet as 6, 50 kuruş.[783]

Similarly, since the peasants did not sell sufficient number of animals[784]and a fair amount of the meat needs of İstanbul were met by Edirne, a scarcity of meat appeared in Edirne. Therefore, the women's branch of the DP in Edirne sent a telegram to Prime Minister Adnan Menderes and explained their problems.[785] Similar to sugar, the price of meat became cheaper for a while in 1955.[786]

According to the journalists of the *Edirne Postası*, the people of Edirne consumed the poorest quality of bread at the highest price in Turkey. Furthermore,

---

[777] "Sebze ve Meyve Çok Pahalı," *Edirne Postası,* 8 July1955.

[778] "Şeker Sıkıntısı Aldı Yürüdü," *Edirne Postası*, 19 June 1948.

[779] "Karne ile Şeker Dağıtılmaya Başlandı," *Edirne Postası*, 7 July 1948

[780] "Şeker Fiyatı İnecek mi?" *Edirne Postası,* 13 May1950.

[781] "Şeker Satışı," *Edirne Postası,* 23 March 1955.

[782] "Şeker Sıkıntısı Acaba Kalkcak mı?" *Edirne Postası*, 10 February 1955.

[783] "1955 Yılı Şeker Pancarı Fiyatları Yenden Tespit ve İlan Edildi," *Edirne Postası,* 23 March 1955.

[784] "Et Kesimi Niçin Azaldı?" *Edirne Postası*, 21 January 1957.

[785] "DP Edirne Kadınlar Kolunun Başvekile Çektiği Telgraf," *Vatandaş Gazetesi*, 14 May 1958.

[786] "Kuzu Eti Ucuzladı" *Edirne Postası,* 26 March 1955.

since rye flour and wheat flour was being mixed, the color of bread was black[787] There was one flour plant in Edirne and due to the lack of competition; the plant owner sought profit rather than public health.[788]Preventing cost of living was difficult. After Greece, Turkey was the second country that had cost of living in Europe.[789] Therefore, the government prepared to review the National Protection Law so as to prevent black marketeering and profiteering.[790]

Due to the continental climate of Edirne, it was cold in winter. Therefore, people needed a great deal of their heats. Since there was high demand, the prices of wood were high in Edirne. Therefore, many citizens had heating problem. In addition to economic problems and floods, due to the heavy rains, transportation of coal to Edirne was difficult in muddy roads.[791]

In the socio-economic development of Edirne province, the danger of the Second World War, the inadequacy of the local administrations and the indifference of the government were indicated.[792] Many young men who had professions could not find work and were spending most of their time in coffeehouses. There were 176 coffeehouses in Edirne. When compared to the general population of Edirne, the number of coffeehouses was high. One of the main reasons for high number of coffeehouses was unemployment. According to journalists of *Edirne Postası,* neither could people of Edirne province explain their socio-economic problems such as the prices of agricultural products, the floods of Maritsa River and the difficulties in

[787] "Edirnelinin Yiyecek Bir Lokma Nefis Ekmekten Mahrumiyeti Doğru mu?"*Edirne Postası,* 1 August 1953.

[788] "Edirne'mizin Ezeli Derdi: Ekmek," *Edirne Postası,* 15 July 1953.

[789] "Hayat Pahalılığnı Önlemek İçin Geniş ve Cezri Tedbirler Alınıyor," *Edirne Postası,* 23 September 1953

[790] "Karaborsacılık ve İhtikarla Savaş İçin Hazırlıklar Yapılıyor," *Edirne Postası*, 3 October 1953

[791] *Edirne Postası*, 23 March 1955.

[792] "Edirneli Gençler Ne Zaman Söz Sahibi Olacak," *Edirne Postası*, 10 February 1955.

transportation nor could the politicians who visited Edirne province offer a radical solution to these problems. [793]

The Marketing of Agricultural Products

As was mentioned before, the Soil Product Office bought the cereals of farmers. Until 1954, due to high foreign demand and the Korean War, Turkey exported these cereals to abroad. After 1954, the Soil Product Office continued to buy wheat from Thrace. While nearly 40,000 tons of wheat was bought in 1954, it increased to around 70,000 tons in1955 in Thrace.[794] Similarly the Soil Product Office bought rice in Thrace. The analysis and examinations of rice were being made before peasants.[795] In order to increase the value of cereal crops and to solve storage problem, almost 28 villages around Lalapaşa Town decided to build silos with a capacity of 400 tons in Lalapaşa.[796]

Peasants who grew agricultural products and such as legumes, fruits, produced foods of animal origin such as yogurts, cheese and meat could sell them in the marketplaces of towns, in fairs and in festivals that were held in spring and autumn. These marketplaces provided producers and consumers with direct communication and with no middleman. Therefore the prices of agricultural goods were cheaper.[797] People purchased most of their food needs from these *panayırs* (fairs). Thanks to the transportation networks and increase in the number of vehicles,

[793] "Kahvehaneler Niçin Çoğalıyor," *Edirne Postası*, 10 February 1955.

[794] "Ofis Trakya'dan Hububat Alıyor" *Edirne Postası,* 29 September 1955

[795]"Toprak Mahsulleri Ofisi Trakya'da Pirinç Mübayaasına Hız Verdi" *İpsala Gazetesi*, 23 March 1955

[796] "Lalapaşa'da Yeni Bir Silo Yapılıyor," *Edirne Postası,* 29 March 1957.

[797] "Trakya Panayırları," *Edirne Postası,* 10 July 1948.

people were able to go to these fairs and festivals. However, since these social activities coincided with seed time and economic trouble, sometimes the peasants had difficulty going to the fairs in spring and marketing their products at the same time.[798]

Similarly, in addition to maintaining the cultural heritage, the Kırkpınar oil wrestling contributed socio-economic life of Edirne. In contrast to the other festivals in Thrace, many people from different cities in Turkey visited Edirne[799] and most of them stayed at the hotels in Edirne.[800] Notably, many peasants who lived in the villages of central district Edirne came to public market.[801]

In order to be introduced the agricultural products, the historical background, and the the cultural values of Edirne, journalists of *Edirne Postası* recommended Kırkpınar had to be turned into a fair. Furthermore, it had to be introduced through advertisements, films and postage stamps. Similarly in order to increase attendance to Kırkpınar Oil Wrestling Festivals, the state railways of Turkish Republic cut the price half in half for passengers who went to Edirne by train between 8 June and 12 June.[802]Thus the number of visitor would be increased and this would contribute the socio-economic life of Edirne.

Due to its geographical position, increasing population, the circle of trade,[803] developed railway and highway transportation network and also the fertile Ergene Plains, Uzunköprü was one of the most developed economic centers in Edirne. In order to support marketing, the mayor of Uzunköprü Mustafa Soykan built 50 shops,

---

[798] "Trakya Panayırları," *Edirne Postası,* 7 May 1949.

[799] *Edirne Postası*, 23 March 1955

[800] "Trakya'da Kırkpınar Güreşleri Hazırlığı Tamamlandı," *Edirne Postası,* 9 May 1950.

[801] "Kırkpınar ve Edirne,"*Edirne Postası*, 7 May 1949

[802] *Edirne Postası,* 9 May 1950.

[803] "Uzunköprü'de Yeni Faaliyetler," *Yeni Edirne Gazetesi* 9 October 1951.

and marketplace and slaughter house that belonged to Uzunköprü Municipality and gas stations. [804] Similarly, at a cost of 58,000 TL, a new stock market building was decided to build in Uzunköprü.[805]

Conclusion

This chapter discussed international politics and the preference of Turkey in the Cold War process. This provided a frame on which to construct an understanding of the political and economic developments. The reflections of the Marshall Plan and liberal economic policies of the Turkish government on Edirne province were discussed. Since Edirne was border city, it had experienced war threat and war economy seriously during WWII. Therefore, in order to explain the role of Marshall Plan in the reconstruction of Turkish agriculture and socio-economic life between 1948 and 1960, Edirne province where there were large amount of cultivable lands was taken as an example. It was observed that how the agricultural structures were transformed through government policies. Comparisons were made between the agricultural data of Edirne province and the rest of Turkey.

In contrast to the 20 percent decrease in population during war period due to migration from Edirne to Anatolian cities and the decrease in birth rate, there was a more than 20 percent increase in the population growth rate in Edirne province due to the migrations of many Turks from Bulgaria and Greece, and the increase in the birth rate between 1948 and 1960. Since almost 80 percent of this population lived in rural areas and mainly were engaged in farming. The fluctuations in the population indicated the rate of employment in the agricultural sector.

[804] "Uzunköprü'de Kalkınma," *Edirne Postası,* 6 May 1957

[805] "Uzunköprü'de Yeni Borsa Binası Yapılıyor," *İpsala Gazetesi,* 3 October 1956.

A remarkable indication was more than three times increase in the area of cultivated lands. While the size of cultivated lands was around 1,700,000 dönüms in 1939,[806] it decreased to 800,000 dönüms during WWII and also the size of cultivated lands increased to 2,900,000 dönüm lands by 1960.[807] The increase in the cultivated lands was a result of agricultural mechanization, the draining of swamplands and the land distribution policy to landless peasants and immigrants.

Agricultural products were separated into cereals, industrial crops, legumes and fruits. Production and cultivation increased from 1948 to 1960. In general, respectively wheat, rye, barley, corn, rice, sugar beet, sesame, tobacco, sunflower, bean, bitter vetch and melon were grown in these years. Similar to the average of Turkey, cereals had the largest cultivation area in Edirne province. Among industrial crops, while cotton, tobacco and potato had the largest cultivation area in the average of Turkey, sesame, sugar beet and sunflower had the largest cultivation area in Edirne province. In legumes, similar to the average of Turkey, bean and bitter vetch had the largest cultivation areas in Edirne province. The cultivation of rice and sun flower increased the need of workers in the agricultural sector.

Thanks to agricultural mechanizations, pesticides, and chemical manure, agricultural productivity increased. For example, on the average per one dönüm between 95 and 100 kilograms in cereals, nearly 210 kilograms in industrial crops and also 75 kilograms in legumes were obtained in 1948.[808]When it comes to 1960, on the average, agricultural productivity per one dönüm increased to nearly 110 kilograms in cereals, nearly 420 kilograms in industrial crops and 125 kilograms in

[806]Republic of Turkey, *Trakya Umumi Müfettişlik Bölgesinde yapılan Toprak Anketi (1939),* p. 11

[807] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1959-1961)* p. 39.

[808]Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1946-1954)* p. 72.

legumes.[809] While explaining these products; the factors that determined the preference of agricultural products such as labor force, the agricultural mechanization and the price of agricultural products were discussed. For example, while total agricultural production was around 220,000 tons in 1948,[810] it reached to around 580,000 tons in 1960.[811]However, after the Korean War and the decrease in foreign demand, the export of cereals decreased. However, the Soil Product Office continued to buy these cereal productions from peasants at a premium. As was discussed, this was the first step to economic problems. In the end, this brought about the re-enactment of the National Protection Law in 1956. Edirne experienced food problems almost similar to the periods of WWII.

Due to the shortage of labor force during war period, more than half of the cultivable lands could not be cultivated. In fact, owing to flat land of Edirne province, cultivated lands were suitable for the use agricultural machine. In the congress of the DP or to the visiting of deputies, many people demanded the increase of agricultural machines in Edirne provinces. Therefore, thanks to the Marshall Plan, these machines were imported from the US and Western Europe. In agricultural mechanization, the number of tractors, combine harvester and tractor ploughs were examined. There were increases in the number of these machines. The number of tractors increased 35 times and reached to 1235,[812] the number combine harvester increased more than four times and reached to 180[813] and also there were around 30,000 tractor plough in Edirne province during the 1950s.[814] Therefore, this period

[809] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1959-1961)* p. 39.

[810]Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1946-1954)* p. 72.

[811] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1959-1961),* p. 39.

[812] Republic of Turkey, *Trakya Umumi Müfettişlik Bölgesinde yapılan Toprak Anketi (1939),* p. 11

[813]Republic of Tukey, *General Census (1950),* p. 45.

[814] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1954-1958),* p.76.

was the first radical step to agricultural mechanization. Namely, due to market oriented production and increasing profit, cultivated lands turned into commodified goods and new modern techniques were used in agriculture to increase productivity. Above all, this process was the indication of the Green Revolution.

Based on the economic activities, the government opened new courses. Especially agricultural courses for men and needle craft courses for women who spent more time at homes as a result of the agricultural mechanization. Namely, the means of the changes in production and production processes influenced the division of labor. Women began to consider decorating at their homes. They also worked to keep their Balkan culture alive. Due to price and agricultural mechanization, many peasants gave up silk worm breeding; instead, they started wheat, sunflower or rice cultivation. Therefore, compared to before, the number of silkworm breeding courses decreased.

In addition to agricultural mechanization, pesticides and manure that increased agricultural productivity; waterworks, highways, and agricultural credits were also other reflections of the Marshall Plan. As was mentioned before, the Bank of Province funded opening new artesian wells. Thus many people became able to irrigate their fields and meet their potable water requirement to some extent. More importantly, the project of the reclamation of the Maritsa River was financed by the Ministry of Public Work with the Marshall Plan. This project aimed to increase the size of cultivated lands, increase agricultural production and prevent the flooding of the Maritsa River. This project was important during the 1950s to indicate the political relations between Turkey and Greece which were two NATO members. Namely, in the subject of flood control in Maritsa, the fate of Edirne province in

Turkey and Evros province in Greece were faced together. In the end, this project could not be completed due to the Cyprus problem, the political pressure on the Turkish Minority in Western Trace and the political pressure on the Greeks in İstanbul during 6-7 September in 1955

Within the scope of the Marshall Plan, the Agricultural Bank provided peasants with credits. Thus people could get agricultural machines and agricultural seeds. Furthermore, joining into cooperatives facilitated loan contracted from the Agricultural Bank. These credits were also provided at seed time and during drought period. However, notably the DP delegates of Edirne province complained that small farmers could not benefit from the credits that were supplied within the scope of the Marshall Plan.

The low topography of Edirne was suitable for highway construction. When compared to the average of Turkey the construction and repair of provincial roads and state roads was quicker and longer in Edirne province. Since 33 kilometers of railways passed from Greece territories and Edirne was a border city that opened to Europe, government tried to repair the main road between Edirne and İstanbul. Furthermore, owing to passing through Greek territory, there were problems in custom clearance, high prices, and the problems of life security. Although Adnan Menderes said that the government would construct a railway track between Pehlivanköy and Edirne, it was not constructed in 1971. Therefore, state highways might have been thought as an alternative to increase the socio-economic development of Edirne. For example, while the length of state highways was 200 km in 1950, it increased to 240 km in 1959. Furthermore, there were no rough roads in Edirne province.[815] Similarly, provincial roads were constructed and its length

[815] Republic of Turkey, *Annual Statistics (1959)*, p. 455.

doubled reaching 360 km during the 1950s.[816] Thus many peasants became able to transport their products to marketplaces in towns, at fairs and festivals. In the construction of main roads, agricultural production, the geographical position of coalfields and flood hazards were considered.

[816] Ibid., p.455

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

This thesis examines the transformation of agricultural structures through government policies in Edirne province between 1939 and 1960. Due to being a border province and its topographical features; economic statistics and the social life of Edirne province reflects the war economy and the story of the Green Revolution. Edirne province can be regarded as a laboratory to understand the developments in the agricultural sector and the socio-economic life in this specific time period. Although there are some differences, generally the agricultural transformation of Edirne complies with the averages of Turkey.

Similar to the average of Turkey, 80 percent of population was peasant in Edirne. Compared to large lands, labor force and the means of production were scarce in the 1940s. In respect of land, thanks to continuous migration movements, land distribution policy had been implemented and big landowners did not seem. However, due to war threat in the 1940s and convenient topography to advanced agricultural methods in the 1950, Edirne was open to state supervision. As far as the government policies did, the growing process of agricultural products and the roles of peasants had importance in the agricultural transformation. For example, while peasants preferred the agricultural crops which could be grown in a short time, did not necessitate much labor force and were high nutritional during war economy; they

mainly regarded the prices of agricultural products in the 1950s. Corn was indispensible crops for peasants both to prevent famine and to smuggle during the Second World War. Namely, smuggle between Greek and Turkish villages also influenced corn cultivation. For example, the size of corn cultivation in Edirne was higher than that of wheat in 1943 throughout Turkey[817] Worse still; some families cooked the herbs they collected in fields or in pastureland. Some floured the roots of couch and made food to eat during the war economy. Apart from these, climate conditions, the railway tracks and the overflowing of the Maritsa River influenced the cultivation areas of some agricultural products such as rye, sugar beet and cotton. Similar to the national average, cereals had the largest cultivation area in Edirne province. However, in respect of industrial products, while cotton had the largest cultivation area across Turkey in the 1940s, sugar beet had the largest cultivation area in Edirne. In the serious war economy, sugar was regarded as life sustaining product and cotton was regarded as more luxury. Besides, thanks to the Alpullu Sugar Beet, people met their sugar needs. In the 1950s, cotton had still the largest cultivation area across Turkey but sesame and sunflower had the largest cultivation in Edirne. Therefore, the war economy, starvation and the growing conditions of agricultural products determined their cultivation areas in the 1940s. However, the price of crops and the migrations became influential on the cultivation areas of agricultural products in Edirne. With the migrations from Bulgaria, many Turks brought and introduced more qualified sunflower seeds.

Due to proximity to battle field, Edirne province experienced more serious and traumatic war economy than the average of Turkey. Not only the taxations of the governments such as the National Protection Law of 1940 and the Soil Products Tax

[817] Ibid., p. 14.

of 1944 but also possible war threat prevented many peasants from cultivating and producing. Especially, with the alliance between Bulgaria and Hitler, northern counties and villages of Edirne province experienced war economy and war threat much more seriously. The cultivation areas and agricultural productions decreased more than half. Similar to other Thracian provinces, there was tight social, economic and political control of the government with the martial law in 1940. Similarly, government implemented rigid policies in the course of levying the National Protection Law of1940 and the Soil Product Tax of 1944. Moreover, many draught animals were confiscated and many young males were conscripted into military. Furthermore, the size of cultivated lands during the Second World War was less than that of the beginnings of the 1930s. For example, on average the size of cultivated lands was 800,000 dönüms and annual production was around 100,000 tons during the war period.[818] Moreover, most of the peasants started to cultivate their lands through sharecropping. Because there was no sufficient number of draught animals; many peasants had difficulty transporting their agricultural productions to plants or mills. The war threat in the border villages of Edirne province frightened so badly many peasants could not go their fields near the Maritsa River.

Since many able young men were conscripted to army, they became a consumer population. In addition to food needs of army, there was serious food problem in cities. The undeveloped transportation network was deepening the crisis. Therefore, many peasants started to produce as much as they consume and they also evade their crops from the control of state. Due to low price and tax policy, peasants tried to meet their own food needs. However, in respect of the Wealth Tax, since lots

[818] Republic of Turkey, *Field Crops Statistics (1940-1945)*, pp. 2-59.

of Jewish were forced to migrate in 1934 and Greeks migrated lastly in 1923, we could not reach any remarkable information.

The economic life of Edirne city almost came to halt. The invasion of Hitler, the attacks of communist group and the strike of railway men in Greece influenced the socio-economic life of Edirne indirectly. In other words, the foreign policy of Turkey and the international developments influenced Edirne province. Since almost 30 km of railways between Uzunköprü and Edirne passed through Greek territory, the food transportation by railways to Edirne stopped. In general, the only means of transportation was oxcarts between Uzunköprü and Edirne. The problem of transportation in railways increased the food problems of Edirne more and more. Furthermore, with the floods of the Maritsa River, thousand dönüms of cultivated land was flooded, many farmers could not cultivate their lands. The locations of two villages were changed. War periods mean famine, serious economic poverty and passive resistance to government policies.

On the other hand, the government tried to support Edirne economically through the Agricultural Bank and the Red Crescent. The government sent agricultural seeds and bread wheat. Due to transportation problems in railways, the government thought that highway construction between İstanbul and Edirne could be alternative to railways. Therefore, there was highway construction during war period. On the other hand government faced off against the peasants of Edirne in the course of collecting taxes.

The government opened agricultural and art courses and supported the foundation of agricultural cooperatives. Thus, the information of peasants about field agriculture, silkworm breeding or apiculture increased. Thanks to cooperatives, farmers came together although they did not have enough capitals to implement their

knowledge. Although these government policies brought temporary solutions, they did not bring any revolutionary changes to the socio-economic life of peasants. With the interventionist policy of the RPP, the people of Edirne got poorer day by day in the 1940s

When the agricultural statistics of Edirne in the war period to those of the 1930s are compared, main problems in agriculture were the insufficiencies of the means of production and capital. The war economy embittered the people of Edirne. Therefore, in the general election of 1946, there was the intensive support of the DP. The voting rate of the DP in Edirne was quite higher than the average of Turkey. Three deputies out of five became the candidate of the DP. Many people needed more liberal economic policies that increased the welfare of the people in Edirne. Due to interventionist policy and war threat, lots of peasants were unable to make profit. Socio-economic problems determined political preference of people in Edirne.

With the political standing of Turkey in the Western Bloc and the Marshall Plan at the end of the 1940s, Turkey was expected to export agricultural products to Western Europe. Due to profit maximization, this international liberal economic policy led to the commodification of lands and market -oriented production in Turkey. In this sense, the topographical and geographical features of Edirne province were quite suitable for the implementation of the Marshall Plan. Namely, in addition to being agricultural province and transportation facilities, the experience of the war economy led the people of Edirne province support the development of the Green Revolution. Within the scope of the Marshall Plan, thanks to land distribution and agricultural mechanization, the size of cultivated lands increased to nearly 3,000,000 dönüms and average annual productions increased to nearly 580,000 tons

in the 1950s.[819] Through its developed highways and railways, Edirne had direct connections with İstanbul and Thessaloniki (Selanik). Thanks to infrastructural investments of government, Edirne can be regarded as one of the most pioneer provinces in the implementation of Marshall Plan in 1948 and in the development of the Green Revolution.

Thanks to economic development, the population of Edirne province increased steadily in the 1950s. In this sense, increasing birth rate, immigrations from Greece and Bulgaria increased the population of Edirne. There were the political oppressions of the socialist government and the confiscation of the properties of Muslims in Bulgaria. Similarly, the Cyprus problem and economic problems led to a social turmoil against Turks in Greece. Therefore many Turks migrated to Turkey. Most of these immigrants were peasants therefore they were employed in agricultural sector. Contrary to popular belief, the use of machine in agriculture did not bring about migration to cities in Edirne province. Since sunflower, sugar beet, sesame and rice cultivation required more workers in rural areas, we could not see remarkable migrations to cities in Edirne until 1975.

Thanks to credits, many peasants started to use pesticides and manure. In addition to the government policy, there was a high demand to agricultural mechanizations among farmers. Soil that was ploughed by tractors could be ready for cultivation. Thanks to pesticides, manures and irrigation, agricultural productivity was being increased. While many agricultural inputs imported from abroad, the farmers of Edirne were selling their products abroad. No doubt human beings could establish his or her domination over the nature, they could determine how to produce

[819] Republic of Turkey, *Agricultural Structures and Production (1959-1961),* p. 39.

and how much to produce. No doubt this was the development of Green Revolution in Edirne Province.

There were around 1235 tractors in Edirne in the 1950s.[820] Although on the average there were nearly four or five tractors in every village of Edirne, tractor owners cultivated his neighbor's fields for a fee. Thus not only agricultural productivity increased but also the social lives of peasants in villages started to change. Most peasants gave up silkworm breeding and the cultivation area of profit making industrial crops increased such as sesame, sugar beet, and sunflower. Thanks to the construction of highways, farmers could transport their products more easily. Tractors should not be thought only as a means of production; it was the means of transportation to cities and towns at the same time. Thus peasants could go to market places in towns once a week. In other words, through the Marshall Plan not only the Turkish economy was integrated to world markets but also tractors, main roads and economic richness increased population movement and domestic trade. Both the socio-economic and the cultural lives of peasants changed. They started to buy some of their needs from the marketplaces such as battery powered radios and rubbers that were more durable than rawhide sandals *(Çarık).* In addition to arriving to markets, main roads and bridges were constructed to allow people to access in case of floods.

Agricultural courses also continued. However, with technological developments in agriculture, new courses were opened such as tractor, agricultural machines, and needlecraft. Many women received education especially in weaving and needlecraft courses. In domestic life, women considered these handicrafts. Even today, when you visit the house of old women who are eighty years old, you can see these flower patterned handcraft or needlecrafts in their rooms.

[820] Republic of Turkey, *Tractor Survey Results, Agricultural Machinery and Equipments (1955-1959)* p. 11.

Through cooperatives, peasants not only developed economically but also took part in their administration. For example, since irrigation cooperatives decided the cultivation area of some products such as rice or sunflowers in Edirne, social solidarity, co-decision, and reconciliations among peasants increased. The decision of peasants became important also in local politics. Thanks to cooperatives, peasants could be joint surety and obtain their agricultural credits more easily. In the multiparty system; many peasants also became the member of political parties. Villages were integrated into Turkish politics. Due to their 80 percent of share, their votes could be determined factor in the elections

Because both countries were member of NATO, there were better political relation between Greece and Turkey in the first half of the 1950s. This increased economic development of Edirne. Furthermore, in order to prevent floods and open new cultivated lands, the two countries involved in the reclamation of the Maritsa River. However, due to the Cyprus problem, undesirable attacks to Greeks in İstanbul during 6-7 September Events and the political pressures on the Turks in Western Thrace, the political relations between Turkey and Greece became worsen. This can be regarded as the indication of the reflections of foreign policy of Turkey and international developments.

With the decrease in foreign demand and the end of the Korean War, the export of agricultural products decreased. Thanks to the populist policies of the DP government that brought about economic devaluation of 1958, agricultural production continued to increase. Even though it was not felt deeply as much as it had been during the WWII, in central district Edirne, it was difficult to find coffee, sugar and tea.

In the reconstruction and agricultural transformation of Edirne province, the role of the Marshall Plan in Turkish agriculture cannot be ignored. Apart from agricultural province and transportation facilities, Edirne had experienced a severe war economy; therefore, the socio-economic development of Edirne was the indication of the contribution of the Marshall Plan. Through a statistical data of Edirne was compared to the average of Turkey, the agricultural transformation in Edirne became clearer and concrete. Finally, when the historiography on Turkish agriculture between 1920 and 1960 is compared, the transformation of agricultural structures though government policies in Edirne province more or less comply with the averages of Turkey. Also with the Marshall Plan, the agricultural structures of Edirne transformed intensively and rapidly. Although there were some differences in the range of agricultural products, Edirne province might be regarded as a sort of laboratory of the agricultural policy of governments between 1939 and 1960. By considering the economic crises in the 1940s and the economic development in the 1950s in Edirne province, the influence of international developments on Turkey can be understood.

APPENDIXES

A. Tables and Maps

Bu donnelere göre Bölge topraklarının yüzde elli dördünün insan kolu ile işlendiği yani tarla ziraati, bağcılık, bahçevanlık ve saireye tahsis olunduğu ve mütebakisinin de hayvan yetiştirmeğe elverişli bulunduğu anlaşılır.

Köy topraklarının terekkübü incelenirken insan kolile işletilen topraklar ile hayvan yetiştiriciliğe salih olan mer'a, çayır, otlak ve yaylak, sazlık ve bataklık, karasuluk ve saire ve göl gibi isimler altındaki toprak parçalarını bir araya topladıktan sonra orman ve baltalık, çalılık ve pırnallık, meşelik ve saire gibi toprak parçalarını toplayarak evvelkilerle birleştirmeli ve zootekni bakımından ve ayrıca tetkik etmelidir.

Toprak anketine göre köy toprakları ve vilâyetlere serpilişleri

	Çanakkale	Edirne	Kırklareli	Tekirdağ	Yekûn
Mer'a	391 094	914 352	716 482	527 926	2 549 854
Çayır	24 123	44 931	22 839	29 421	121 314
Otlak ve yaylak	48 860	136 378	120 272	18 450	323 960
Sazlık ve bataklık	18 125	105 615	5 360	3 964	133 064
Karasuluk ve saire	3 523	4 750	2 500	3 650	14 423
Göl	2 287	32 688	2 730	1 735	39 440
Tarlalar	1 590 080	2 071 319	1 576 565	2 327 745	7 565 709
Bağlar	34 239	50 387	20 501	37 699	142 326
Meyve bahçeleri	257 691	12 784	1 429	2 777	274 681
Sebze bahçeleri	5 349	2 999	4 709	3 010	16 067
Gülüstanlar	836	9 022	1 161	7	11 026
Orman ve baltalık	431 073	298 159	1 148 149	105 984	1 983 365
Çalılık ve pırnallık	466 389	212 747	243 804	66 438	989 378
Meşelik ve saire	217 369	147 769	642 903	166 330	1 174 371
Yekûn	3 491 038	4 043 900	4 508 904	3 295 136	15 338 978

a) **Mer'a :**

Bölge köylerinin mer'a adı ile tesahüp ettikleri toprak parçaları toprak terekkübü meyanında iki buçuk milyon dekar gibi büyük bir kısım teşkil etmektedir. Bu miktar köy topraklarının yüzde 16.62 sine ve coğrafi büyüklüğünde yüzde dokuzuna tekabül etmektedir. Her köy mer'aya malik değildir. Mevcut 1310 köyün yüzde 74 dü nisbetinde 982 tane mer'alı köy vardır. Mevcut mer'a, mevcut 1310 köye taksim olunduğu zaman ortalama bir köye 1946 dekar mer'a isabet eder. Fakat mer'alı köylerin adedi 982 olduğundan bir mer'alı köye ortalama 2595 dekar mer'a isabet ettigi meydana çıkar.

Mer'aların vilâyetlere serpilişleri

Vilâyetler :	Dekar	%
Çanakkale	391 094	15
Edirne	914 352	36
Kırklareli	716 482	28
Tekirdağ	527 926	21
YEKÛN	2 549 854	100

Table 1-Source: Republic of Turkey, *Trakya Umumi Müfettişlik Bölgesinde yapılan Toprak Anketi (1939)*, p.7

Vilâyetler itibarile

Toprağı işleyen ve hazırlayan ziraat alât ve makineleri

1 9 4 0

Vilâyetler	Tek tekerlekli pulluklar	Çift tekerlekli pulluklar	Döner kulaklı pulluklar	Kültivatör ve benzerleri	Her nevi tırmıklar	Disk — Harolar	Bisok, trisok ve polisok gibi müteadit kulaklı pulluklar	Motoşarrü	Traktör	Traktöre mahsus soklu pulluk	Traktöre mahsus diskli pulluk	YEKÛN
Bursa	20 793	679	196	—	1 924	5	12	—	27	10	19	23 665
Edirne	15 754	985	168	12	4 312	2	401	—	34	21	15	21 704
İstanbul	13 195	681	204	13	1 662	4	102	—	60	41	27	15 989
Kırklareli	12 568	1 401	10	—	2 083	2	—	—	9	—	9	16 082
Kocaeli	8 400	6 046	1 309	104	10 707	41	—	—	6	6	4	26 623
Tekirdağ	12 334	5 071	9	24	909	7	—	—	46	39	13	18 452
Yekûn	**83 044**	**14 863**	**1 896**	**153**	**21 597**	**61**	**515**	**—**	**182**	**117**	**87**	**122 515**
Antalya	5 737	305	7	21	8 731	67	—	—	64	19	40	14 991
G. Antep	220	260	5	1	13	3	—	—	2	5	4	513
İçel	848	122	—	17	14	3	5	1	51	53	1	1 115
Maraş	161	73	14	2	6	1	—	1	5	5	1	269
Seyhan	2 954	5 797	325	940	1 325	62	301	30	353	353	21	12 641
Hatay	60	203	—	23	3	3	42	—	10	2	—	346
Yekûn	**9 980**	**6 760**	**351**	**1 004**	**10 092**	**139**	**348**	**32**	**485**	**437**	**67**	**29 695**
Ağrı	27	900	—	1	10	—	—	—	—	—	—	938
Çoruh	50	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	50
Erzincan	293	—	125	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	418
Erzurum	—	2 424	1 149	—	2 780	1	—	—	4	1	1	6 360
Kars	5 181	761	107	—	2 868	—	3	—	2	—	—	8 922
Yekûn	**5 551**	**4 085**	**1 381**	**1**	**5 658**	**1**	**3**	**—**	**6**	**1**	**1**	**16 688**

Table 2- Source: Republic of Turkey. *Tractor Survey Results*, *Agricultural Machinery and Equipments (1955-1959)*, p.11

ZİRAAT SAYIMI
VİLÂYETLER İTİBARİYLE SAYIM SONUÇLARI
CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE
RESULTS BY PROVINCES
1950

Con.

VİLÂYETLER — PROVINCES										Unit	ITEMS
Çoruh		Çorum		Denizli		Diyarbakır		Edirne			
Şehir *Cities*	Köy *Villages*	Şehir *Cities*	Köy *Villages*	Şehir *Cities*	Köy *Villages*	Şehir *Cities*	Köy *Villages*	Şehir *Cities*	Köy *Villages*		
3 599	133 458	6 965	181 626	6 559	119 242	6 211	144 947	11 770	128 769	*Number*	*11. Cattle (Total)*
2 428	67 150	3 320	73 450	2 557	44 368	2 758	59 367	4 615	51 816	*Number*	*a) Cows and herfers (2 years old and over)*
422	39 832	1 609	68 760	2 499	49 383	1 657	47 815	4 119	48 044	*Number*	*b) Oxen (2 years old and over)*
61	2 624	220	6 959	121	3 032	425	8 516	30	1 232	*Number*	*c) Bulls (2 years old and over)*
688	23 852	1 816	32 457	1 382	22 459	1 371	29 249	3 006	27 677	*Number*	*d) Young cattle (under 2 years old)*
954	115 368	9 941	214 473	13 538	269 642	5 061	342 157	34 898	491 131	*Number*	*12. Sheep (Total)*
548	75 545	6 009	143 241	8 499	175 030	3 203	217 355	22 078	317 420	*Number*	*a) Ewes (1 year old and over)*
99	9 817	1 274	11 299	1 661	17 315	330	24 342	1 427	23 070	*Number*	*b) Rams and weathers (1 year old and over)*
307	30 006	2 658	59 933	3 378	77 297	1 528	100 460	11 393	150 641	*Number*	*c) Lambs (under 1 year old)*
—	6	3 398	170 865	3	407	—	9	—	—	*Number*	*13. Angora goats (Total)*
—	6	1 889	101 571	2	252	—	5	—	—	*Number*	*a) Female a. goats (1 year old and over)*
—	—	396	25 674	1	33	—	1	—	—	*Number*	*b) Male a. goats (1 year old and over)*
—	—	1 113	43 620	—	122	—	3	—	—	*Number*	*c) Kids (under 1 years old)*
1 680	96 659	2 945	128 915	14 477	487 533	9 077	365 043	4 906	141 187	*Number*	*14. Common goats (Total)*
1 066	64 848	1 907	85 714	8 254	284 823	5 806	226 106	3 059	86 700	*Number*	*a) Female c. goats (1 year old and over)*
112	7 225	387	7 622	1 761	60 812	643	41 379	323	12 379	*Number*	*b) Male c. goats (1 year old and over)*
502	24 586	651	35 579	4 462	141 898	2 628	97 558	1 524	42 108	*Number*	*c) Kids (under 1 year)*
											WORK ANIMALS
49	2 997	647	5 513	1 353	11 751	450	4 551	1 049	4 916	*Number*	*15. Horses*
6	323	66	727	110	1 668	206	1 161	64	122	*Number*	*16. Mules*
68	1 756	1 471	26 535	2 809	31 559	1 463	17 701	804	6 687	*Number*	*17. Donkeys*
—	170	539	11 253	121	1 774	155	4 692	291	2 805	*Number*	*18. Buffalo oxen*
—	38	74	1 868	29	909	3	1 251	88	1 416	*Number*	*19. Buffalo cows*
342	28 522	1 486	53 932	2 299	43 075	1 600	42 967	3 914	33 695	*Number*	*20. Oxen*
—	165	16	1 599	429	7 853	234	5 230	816	9 690	*Number*	*21. Cows*
											POULTRY
12	2	269	12 880	370	8 478	363	13 112	1 231	14 343	*Number*	*22. Turkeys*
22	542	542	21 929	657	3 852	214	3 220	533	6 421	*Number*	*23. Geese*
											AREA SOWN AND PRODUCTION
											A — CEREALS
206	5 443	4 623	62 256	2 890	56 095	2 486	49 597	7 060	54 654	*Hectare*	*24. Wheat — Area*
180	4 164	4 678	54 530	1 712	27 843	1 898	39 087	6 527	42 413	*Tons*	*Production*
16	3 267	2 861	36 489	2 461	38 607	1 279	25 360	2 783	13 217	*Hectare*	*25. Barley — Area*
16	3 394	3 740	40 418	3 418	38 725	1 092	20 913	4 368	16 553	*Tons*	*Production*

Table 3- Source: Republic of Turkey. *Agricultural Census Results (1950).*p. 35

BİTKİSEL ÜRETİM MİKTARLARI VE ÜRETİCİ FİYATLARI (Devamı)

	1952		1953		1954		1955	
	Üretim (Ton)	Fiyat (Krş)	Üretim (Ton)	Fiyat (Krş)	Üretim (Ton)	Fiyat (Krş)	Üretim (Ton)	Fiyat (Krş)
Hububat								
Bugday	5 802 300	28 31	7 200 000	29.45	4 410 000	29 79	6 210 000	29.67
Arpa	3 189 000	17 43	3 640 000	18.81	2 400 000	19 80	2 985 000	22 76
Çavdar	670 000	19 67	730 000	20.96	440 000	21 81	650 000	23 91
Yulaf	405 000	15 06	415 800	16.04	325 000	19 47	356 000	20 12
Mahlût	385 000	19 29	450 000	20 57	332 000	23 75	412 000	23.80
Kaplıca	130 000	14 56	129 700	14 21	110 000	18.46	116 000	18.71
Mısır	837 000	17 03	759 700	19 04	914 000	21 67	855 000	22 44
Darı	78 000	15 90	102 700	15 65	88 000	17 62	92 000	18.77
Çeltik	158 333	48 86	181 167	44 89	183 333	42 14	101 667	46.53
Kuş yemi	6 000	24 00	7 300	23 84	5 200	62.13	6 400	60.61
Bakliyat								
Bakla	36 000	20 60	40 000	23 20	37 000	26 05	38 000	26 87
Bezelye	760	30 81	800	47 95	1 250	54 55	900	61.34
Nohut	95 000	26 96	83 300	33 94	75 000	40 66	76 000	42 98
Fasulye	98 000	38 80	107 700	49 44	101 000	54 73	111 000	52 50
Mercimek	77 000	27 09	75 700	28 38	64 000	28.66	77 000	30 05
Börülce	4 300	33 08	3 800	38 28	3 600	39 84	3 500	44.74
Fig	55 000	17 03	64 000	18.31	48 700	23 04	52 000	22.46
Burçak	112 000	18.27	126 200	20.06	88 600	23 49	107 000	22.85
Diğer	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Diğer tarla mahsulleri								
Tütün	91 958	240.55	117 795	235.00	102 000	222.52	120 000	256.62
Şeker pancarı	1 068 936	6.17	1 170 000	6.18	1 200 000	6.27	1 736 000	8.09
Patates	873 000	17.85	1 000 000	21.49	1 000 000	23.21	1 116 000	24.55
Afyon sakızı	456	366692	469	375503	131	368243	300	360063
Afyon tohumu	24 000	56.56	30 300	55.62	6 555	84.35	20 000	93.58
Keten lif	3 400	118 69	3 300	144.69	3 400	162.58	6 000	177 92
Keten tohumu	21 800	44.14	24 300	45.04	15 000	54.22	18 000	58.73
Pamuk-kütlü	445 946	100 44	375 676	76.97	383 784	85.60	424 324	103.47
Kenevir lif	11 000	126.20	11 000	155.68	12 100	149.26	11 000	161.95
Kendir kenevir tohumu	4 700	42.16	4 400	57.94	4 800	94.07	4 300	75.43
Susam	29 000	82.18	40 000	84.70	48 000	85.54	51 000	90.36
Ay çiçeği	99 000	26.29	114 000	27.22	120 000	34.79	138 000	36.49
Soya	2 900	34.38	3 440	43.00	4 180	42.64	4 000	51.94
Yer fıstığı	11 600	45.47	12 400	48.53	14 600	61.79	16 200	57.89
Aspir	1 190	49.02	660	30.16	480	60.79	320	74.05
Kolza	2 740	37.63	3 050	35.59	1 500	35.59	1 730	44.47
Hayvan pancarı	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Anason	1 300	89.81	1 280	109.58	1 200	109.58	1 300	109.58
Soğan	222 000	16.72	302 300	15.06	285 000	16.28	300 000	15.77
Sarmısak	28 000	68.78	30 900	72.58	30 000	62 67	34 000	54.80
Kavun-karpuz	2 008 289	6.34	2 048 674	6.30	1 895 819	6.58	1 887 000	5.80

22

Table 4- Source: Republic of Turkey, *Bitkisel Üretim Miktarları, Üretici Fiyatları ve Girdiler (1948-1974)*, p. 22.

EDİRNE

Mahsuller *Crops*	1958 Ekiliş *Area Sown* Hektar *Hectares*	1958 İstihsal *Production* Ton *Tons*	1958 Rand. *Yield* Hek./Kg. *Kg.perHec.*	1959 Ekiliş *Area Sown* Hektar *Hectares*	1959 İstihsal *Production* Ton *Tons*	1959 Rand. *Yield* Hek./Kg. *Kg.perHec.*	1960 Ekiliş *Area Sown* Hektar *Hectares*	1960 İstihsal *Production* Ton *Tons*	1960 Rand. *Yield* Hek./Kg. *Kg.perHec.*
Hububat — Cereals									
Toplam — *Total*	210 456	214 700	1020	223 217	249 384	1117	216 118	231 198	1069
Buğday — *Wheat*	94 560	98 552	1042	103 100	109 624	1063	107 557	116 575	1083
Arpa — *Barley*	32 040	37 210	1161	39 500	46 151	1168	33 750	37 980	1125
Çavdar — *Rye*	29 550	27 210	920	32 100	32 080	999	27 600	25 000	905
Yulaf — *Oats*	7 265	7 125	980	7 500	7 540	1005	7 450	6 572	882
Kaplıca — *Speltz*	6 050	5 940	981	6 700	7 740	1155	6 620	7 050	1064
Mısır — *Maize*	22 450	16 680	742	20 500	27 480	1340	20 800	23 780	1143
Darı — *Millet*	1 110	945	851	1 300	1 305	1003	1 140	1 560	1368
Pirinç — *Rice*	13 071	17 491	1338	7 067	12 664	1791	6 000	7 337	1222
Kuşyemi — *Canary seed*	1 030	799	775	1 150	970	843	1 226	997	813
Mahlût — *Mixed grains*	3 330	2 748	825	4 300	3 830	890	3 975	4 347	1093
Bakliyat — Pulses									
Toplam — *Total*	2 657	2 057	774	3 575	3 859	1079	4 078	5 137	1259
Bakla — *Broad beans*	61	71	1163	100	110	1100	360	480	1333
Nohut — *Chick peas*	470	274	582	400	340	850	390	325	841
Fasulye — *Dry beans*	1 170	1 049	896	1 725	2 180	1263	2 045	3 201	1565
Mercimek — *Lentils*	300	155	516	300	225	750	425	309	727
Börülce — *Kidney beans*	20	10	500	10	10	1000	40	40	1000
Fiğ — *Cow vetch*	51	68	1333	530	518	977	193	159	823
Burçak — *Wild vetch*	585	430	735	510	476	933	605	600	991
Diğerleri — *Others*	—	—	—	—	—	—	20	20	1000
Sınaî Bitkiler — Industrial Crops									
Toplam — *Total*	46 111	96 894	2101	43 911	204 590	4659	44 397	185 693	4182
Tütün — *Tobacco*	226	190	840	415	345	831	356	281	789
Patates — *Potatoes*	638	6 557	10277	550	4 170	7581	695	7 170	10316
Pancar — *Sugar beets*	4 746	61 900	13042	6 680	166 151	24872	6 582	140 594	21360
Pamuk — *Cotton* Saf — *Lint*	251	65	258	200	56	280	295	89	301
Pamuk — *Cotton* Tohum — *Seed*		66	262		100	500		158	535
Keten — *Flax* Lif — *Fiber*	272	—	—	300	1	3	230	—	—
Keten — *Flax* Tohum — *Seed*		187	687		248	826		214	930
Soğan — *Onion*	886	5 765	6506	855	5 150	6023	963	7 816	8116
Sarmısak — *Garlic*	456	1 690	3706	400	713	1782	422	1 601	3793
Susam — *Sesame*	12 650	5 141	406	6 550	4 445	678	6 300	3 410	541
Ayçiçeği — *Sunflower*	24 180	13 634	563	25 600	21 190	827	25 080	21 198	845
Diğerleri — *Others*	1 806	1 699	940	2 361	2 021	855	3 474	3 162	910
Meyveler — Fruits									
Üzüm — *Grapes*	7 935	10 250	1291	7 645	17 355	2270	7 740	13 394	1730
Kavun, Karpuz — *Melons*	10 760	138 420	12864	11 400	138 750	12171	11 480	140 450	12234
Diğer meyveler* — *Other fruits*	403	2 959	7	413	6 921	17	424	5 273	12
Fıstık, Badem, Ceviz* — *Pistachios, Almonds, Walnuts*	34	299	9	35	582	17	35	390	11

*Ekilen saha yerine 1000 ağaç.

**Number of trees in thousands.*

Hayvanlar ve hayvan mahsulleri — Livestock and livestock products

Baş — Head

(1958 — 1960)

Hayvan cinsleri *Kinds of livestock*	1958	1959	1960	Hayvan mahsulleri *Livestock products*	1958 Ton	1959 Ton	1960 Ton
Koyun — *Sheep*	360 460	490 015	687 880	Süt istihsali — *Milk Productions*			
Kılkeçi — *Ordinary goats*	99 823	93 434	92 909	Koyun sütü — *Sheep*	12 599	14 386	15 347
Sığır — *Cattle*	146 517	147 108	142 426	Kılkeçi sütü — *Ordinary goats*	4 642	4 554	4 781
Manda — *Buffaloes*	18 042	19 755	18 729	İnek sütü — *Cows*	22 838	27 644	27 058
Deve — *Camels*	189	116	163	Manda sütü — *Buffaloes*	4 015	5 138	5 253
At — *Horses*	8 691	9 028	9 868				
Katır — *Mules*	141	168	153	Yapağı — *Wool*	769	884	937
Eşek — *Donkeys*	10 365	11 207	11 788	Kıl — *Hair*	94	94	98
Arı Kovanı — *Beehives*	18 417	18 290	19 880	Bal — *Honey*	177	258	214
Tavuk, horoz (1000) — *Chickens*	385	422	421	Yumurta (1000)* — *Eggs*	17 771	20 210	20 040

*Bin adettir. — *1000 number.*

Table 5- Source: Republic of Turkey. *Agricultural Structures and Production (1958-1960).*p. 39



Map 1- Source: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/iktisadi harita



Map 2- Source: *Edirne Postası*, 13. May1957

B. Photo Album



Edirne- Tunca Nehri Taşkını 1940
Source: http://wowturkey.com/forum/viewtopic.php?t=21509&start=145



Edirne – Trakya Un Fabrikası 1950
Source: http://www.trakyaun.com.tr/?page_id=7

BİBLIOGRAPHY

Interviewees

Peasants:

Hamit Top, interview by author, 20 August 2014, Edirne Turkey

İbrahim Ceylan, interview by author, 20 July 2010, Edirne, Turkey

Gezer Hayri, interview by author, 20 July 2007, Edirne, Turkey

Mehmet Dere, interview by author, 20 July 2013, Edirne, Turkey

Nevzat Hanımeli, interview by author, 10 August 20013, Edirne, Turkey

Other Sources:

Akın, Fehmi. *Çok Partili Hayata Geçiş.* Ankara: Anektod Yayınevi, 2008

Akman, Şefik Taylan and Akman. İnci Solak. "İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yıllarında Türkiye de Hububat Üretiminin Vergilendirilmesi." *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi* 2, no.1 (December 2011): 73-91.

Aresvik, Oddvar. *The Agricultural Development of Turkey*. Newyork: American Economic Association**,** 1975

Avşaroğlu, Nadir (21May 2009) "Marshall Planı Amerikan Dış Kredileri ve Türkiye Madencilik Sektörüne Etkileri." Retrieved 10 Fbruary 2015, from https://madencilikrehberi.files.wordpress.com/2012/02/marshall-planc4b1-amerikan-dc4b1c59f-kredileri-ve-tc3bcrkiye-madencilik-sektc3b6rc3bcne-etkileri.pdf

Aydın, Erdem."Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin Kuruluş Yıllarında Sağlık Hizmetleri." *Ankara Eczacılık Fakültesi Dergisi* 3, no. 31 (March 2002): 183-192

Bakar, Bülent."İkinci Dünya Savaşında Trakya dan Anadolu'ya Göç ve Paniğe Karşı Propoganda." *Yakın Dönem Türkiye Araştırmaları Dergisi,* no.12 (2007):1-37

Başer, Kadir. "1923-1950 Yılları Arasında Türkiye de Toprak Dağılımı ve Toprak Reformunun Politik Sonuçları." *Dumplupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, no.38 (October, 2013): 203-216.

Bayram, Feridun. *Eğitimenler, Öğrenmeyi Öğretme Ustaları.* Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1999

Baytal, Yaşar. "Demokrat Parti Dönemi Ekonomi Politikaları 1950-1957."*Ankara Üniversitesi Türk İnkılap Tarihi Enstitüsü Atatürk Yolu Dergisi,* no. 40 (November 2007) : 545-567.

Braudel, Fernand. *The Structures of Everday Life Civilization and Capitalism 15th and 18th*. London : Collins**,** 1981

Çalgüner,*"*Cemil. *Arazi Mülkiyet Rejimi ve Türkiyedeki Durum.* Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Ziraat Fakültesi Yayınları, 1970.

Çamurcuoğlu, Gülden. "Türkiye Cumhuriyeti nin Toprak Reformu ve Milli Burjuvasi Yaratma Çabası." *Gazi Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi* 8*,* no. 1-2, (2009):161-178.

Çınar, Fahri Türk Servet. "Türkiye İle Almanya Arasında Bilimsel İlişkiler: Türk Alman Üniversiteleri." *Akademik Bakış Dergisi* 7, no. 13 (Winter 2013): 45-65

Çolak, Filiz. "Bulgaristan Türklerinin Türkiye'ye Göç Hareketi (1950-1951). "*Tarih Okulu Dergisi*, no.14 **(**Spring- Summer 2013): 113-145.

Demirer, Mehmet Arif. *Atatürk Bayar ve Menderes EksenindeMasallar ve Gerçekler*. Ankara: Lazer Yayınları, 2005.

Erdem, Çiğdem. "Cumhuriyet Yönetiminin 1930'lu Yıllarda Köyde ve Köylülükte Dönüşümü Gerçekleştirme İsteğinin Bir Aracı Olarak Köy Eğitmen Kursları." *Gazi Üniversitesi İktisadi İdari Bilimler Dergisi* 10, no. 3 (2008):187-200.

Eroğul, Cem. *Demokrat Parti Tarihi ve İdeolojisi.* Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi, 1970

Eşiyok, Ali. *Kalkınma Sürecinde Tarım Sektörünün Ekonomideki Yeri, Yapısı ve Gelişme Dinamikleri (1923-2004)*. Ankara, Türkiye Kalkınma Bankası A.Ş, 2004.

Ertem, Barış."Türkiye –ABD İlişkilerinde Truman Doktrini ve Marshall Planı." *Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* 12, no.21 (2009): 377-397

Genç, Serkan. *Edirne Tunca Bölgesinde Sürdürülebilir Yerleşmenin Yeniden Biçimlendirilmesi.* MA Thesis, Trakya University, 2006.

Gökköl, Mirza. *Türkiye Buğdayları.* İstanbul: T.C Ziraat Vekaleti Yayınları, 1935

İnan, Süleyman. "Toprak Reformunun En Çok Tartışılan Maddesi: 17. Madde"*Journal of Historical Studies*, no.3 (2005): 45-57.

İnce, Erdal. *"*Köylüyü Topraklandırma Kanunun Türk Siyasal Yapısının Oluşumu Üzerindeki Etkileri." *Çağdaş Türkiye Araştırmaları Dergisi* 5*,* no.13 (Autumn 2006): 59-78.

İbrahim İnci, "Atatürk'ün Direktif ve Tavsiyeleri Işığında Türk Tarımındaki Gelişmeler (1923-1938)," *Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Dergisi* 26, no. 77 (2010); İbrahim İnci, "Atatürk'ün Direktif ve Tavsiyeleri Işığında Türk Tarımındaki Gelişmeler (1923-1938)," Retrieved 10 March 2015, from

http://www.isteataturk.com/haber/6540/ataturk-8217un-direktif-ve-tavsiyeleri-isiginda-turk-tarimindaki-gelismeler-1

İnci, İbrahim. "Atatürk Dönemi Türkiyesinde Toprak Mülkiyet Dağılımı İle İlgili Bazı Düzenlemeler." *A.Ü Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, no. 44 (2010): 345-359.

Kadıoğlu, Sevtap. "Ankara Yüksek Ziraat Enstitüsünde Mülteci Bilim Adamları."*Osmanlı Bilimi Araştırmaları Dergisi* 9, no.1-2 (2007-2008): 183-197.

Kanca, Osman Cenk."1950-1960 Arası Türkiye'de Uygulanan Sosyo-ekonomik Politikalar." *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* 9, no. 19 (2012): 47-63.

Karabulut, Umut. "Cumhuriyetin İlk Yıllarında Sağlık Hizmetlerine Toplu Bir Bakış: Dr. Refik Saydam'ın Sağlık Bakanlığı ve Hizmetleri (1925-1937)." *Çağdaş Türkiye Tarihi Araştırmaları Dergisi* 6, no.15 (Autumn 2007): 151-161.

Karaömerlioğlu, Mehmet Asım." Bir Tepeden Reform Denemesi: Çiftçiyi Topraklandırma Kanununun Hikayesi."*Birikim Yayınları***,** no. 107 (March 1998): 31-47.

Kazancıgil, Ratip. *Edirne'nin Sağlık ve Sosyal Yardım Tarihi (1361-2008*). Edirne: Trakya Üniversitesi Rektörlüğü Yayınları, 2009

Kazgan, Gülten. *Tarım ve Gelişme.* İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Yayınları, 1977.

Keyder, Çağlar. *Türkiye de Devlet ve Sınıflar*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2005.

Keyder, Çağlar. *Dünya Ekonomisi içinde Türkiye (1923-1929)*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları**,** 1982

Keyder, Çağlar. "Tarımda Küçük Meta üretiminin yerleşmesi," in *Türkiye'de Tarımsal Yapılar, (1923-2008),*eds., Şevket Pamuk and Zafer Toprak, 163-175. Ankara: Yurt Yayınları, 2008.

Kip, Ergün."Türkiye'de Taban Fiyatları Destekleme Alımları ve İç Ticaret Hadleri," in *Türkiye'de Tarımsal Yapılar (1923-2000),* eds., Şevket Pamuk and Zafer Toprak, 135-163. Ankara: Yurt Yayınları, 2008.

Kocamemi, Fazıl Bülent. *Urumeli'nin Gözyaşları.* İstanbul: İskenderiye Yayınları, 2012.

Koç, İsmet. Eryurt Mehmet Ali and Beşe Şebnem Canbolat. "Türkiye'de Nüfus ve Nüfus Politikaları Öngörüler,"*Amme İdaresi Dergisi* 46, no. 4 (December 2013): 129-156

Koraltürk, Murat. "Türkiye Ekonomisi (1923-1960)."*Türkler,* Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, 2002.

Metinsoy,"Murat. *Wars outside the War: The Social Impact of The Second World War on Turkey.* MA Thesis, Boğaziçi University, 2004.

Neumark, Fritz. *Boğaziçine Sığınanlar, Türkiye'ye İltica Eden Alman İlim, Siyaset ve Sanat Adamları (1933-1953).* İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Maliye Bölümü Yayını, 1982.

Orwen, Roger. Pamuk, Şevket. *20yy da Orta Doğu Ekonomileri Tarihi.* İstanbul: Sabancı Üniversitesi Yayınları**,** 2002.

Oran, Baskın. *Türk Dış Politikası (1919-1980).* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002.

Öke, Mim Kemal. Mütercimler, Erol. *Yalnızlıktan Saygınlığa Demokrat Partinin Dış Politikası.* Ankara: Ankara Demokratlar Kulübü Yayınları, 2000.

Ören, Tolga.”Marshal Planı ve Türkiye :Tarım, Sulama, Ulaştırma, Madencilik, Özel Sektör, Emek Hareketi, Savunma ve Gündelik Yaşam Örnekleri”*İstanbul Ticaret Odası Yayınları*, no. 67 (2010): 463-501

Özbek, Nadir.”Kemalist Rejim ve Populizmin Sınırları: Büyük Buhran ve Buğday Alım Politikaları 1931 -1937.” *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 96 (Spring 2003): 219-238

Özey, Ramazan.”19. Asırda Edirne Vilayeti Coğrafyası,”*Marmara Coğrafya Dergisi,* no. 6 (2002): 2-36.

Özkan, M. Selçuk. Temizer, Abidin. “ İkinci Dünya Savaşı yıllarında Türkiye’de Karaborsacılık” *Uluslararsı Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi* 2, no. 9 (Autumn 2009): 319-325

Pamuk, Şevket. “İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yılların da Devlet, Tarımsal Yapılar ve Dönüşüm,” in *Türkiye’de Tarımsal Yapılar (1923-2000),* eds., Şevket Pamuk and Zafer Toprak, 91-109, Ankara: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2008.

Pamuk, Şevket. *Seçme Eserleri II Osmanlı’dan Cumhuriyet’e Küreselleşme, İktisat Politikaları ve Büyüme.* İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2009.

Republic of Turkey. *Agricultural Census (1927).* Ankara: Prime Ministry, 1970.

Republic of Turkey. *Agricultural Census Results (1950).* Ankara: Prime Ministry,1956.

Republic of Turkey. *Agricultural Equipments and Machinery Statistics (1940).*İstanbul: Hüsnütabiat Basımevi, 1941.

Republic of Turkey. *Agricultural Structures and Production (1946-1954).* Ankara: Prime Ministry, 1955.

Republic of Turkey. *Agricultural Structures and Production (1958-1960).* Ankara: Prime Ministry, 1962

Republic of Turkey. *Agricultural Structures and Production (1959-1961).* Ankara: Prime Ministry, 1963.

Republic of Turkey. *Agricultural Structures and Production* (1954-1958). Ankara: Prime Ministry, 1959.

Republic of Turkey. *Annual Statistics (1952).* Ankara: Prime Ministry. 1953.

Republic of Turkey. *Annual Statistics (1959)*. Ankara: Prime Ministry, 1961.

Republic of Turkey, *Bitkisel Üretim Miktarları, Üretici Fiyatları ve Girdiler (1948-1974),* Ankara: Prime Ministry, 1976.

Republic of Turkey. *Field Crops Statistics (1940-1945).* Ankara: Prime Ministry,1947.

Republic of Turkey. *Field Crops Statistics (1937-1939*). Ankara: Recep Ulusoğlu Basımevi, 1940.

Republic of Turkey. *General Census (1940).* Ankara: Prime Ministry, 1940.

Republic of Tukey. *General Census (1950).* Ankara: Prime Ministry, 1951.

Republic of Turkey. *General Census (1955).* İstanbul: Prime Ministry 1961.

Republic of Turkey. *General Census (1960).* Ankara: Devlet İstatistik Enstitüsü Matbaası, 1963.

Republic of Turkey. *Poultry Husbandry, Beekeeping, Silkworm Breeding Statistics (1935-1943).* Ankara: Prime Minister 1945.

Republic of Turkey. *The Summary of Agricultural Statistics (1939-1959).* Ankara: Prime Ministry, 1960.

Republic of Turkey. *Trakya Umumi Müfettişlik Bölgesinde yapılan Toprak Anketi (1939).* Ankara: Prime Ministry, 1939.

Republic of Turkey. *Tractor Survey Results*, *Agricultural Machinery and Equipments (1955-1959)* Ankara: Ankara Basım ve Ciltevi, 1960

Republic of Turkey, Edirne Valiliği, *Edirne İl Yıllığı*, Edirne: Edirne Valiliği, 2005.

Republic of Turkey, Edirne Ticaret ve Sanayi Odası, *Edirne Ticaret ve Sanayi Odası Rehberi, Yüzüncü Yıl Anısına (1885-1985).* İstanbul: Araştırma Basımevi,1985.

Republic of Turkey, Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi (The Grand National Assembly of Turkey). Term.5, Legislative Year 1, Vol. 6, 1934.

Republic of Turkey, Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi (The Grand National Assembly of Turkey). Term 6, Legislative Year 1, Vol. 2, Session 7, 3 May 1939.

Republic of Turkey, Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi(The Grand National Assembly of Turkey). Term 8, Legislative Year 2, Vol. 8, Session 3, 5 December 1947.

Republic of Turkey, Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi Zabıt Ceridesi, Term 10, Legislative Year 2, Vol. 5, Session 1, 2 February 1955.

Republic of Turkey, Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi Zabıt Ceridesi, Term 10, Legislative Year 3, Vol. 10, Session 2, 27 December 1956.

Sarç, Ömer Celal. *Türkiye Ekonomisinin Genel Esasları.* İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1944.

Sarınay, Yusuf. "Cumhuriyet Döneminde Ankara'ya Yapılan Göçler (1923-1990)"*Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Dergisi,* no.27 (2011): 351-387.

Silier, Oya. *Türkiye de Tarımsal Yapının Gelişimi (1923-1938).* İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınevi, 1981.

Singer, Morris. *Economic Development in the Context of Short Term Public Policies* **(***1938-1960).* Ankara: Turkish Economic Societies Publication, 1977.

Şener, Sefer. *"*İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yıllarında Türkiye de Tarım Politikası Arayışları"*Koceli Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* 7, no. 1 (2014): 73-92.

Şimşek, Halil and Arslan, Fulya."Yeni Edirne Gazetesine Göre Bulgaristandan Türkiye'ye Göçler 1950-1951" *Çanakkale Araştırmaları Türk Yıllığı Dergisi*, no.13 (Autumn, 2012): 105-126.

Tekeli, İlhan and İlkin, Selim "Devletçilik Dönemi Tarım Politikaları." *Türkiye'de Tarımsal Yapılar (1923-2000),* eds., Zafer Toprak and Şevket Pamuk, 37-91. Ankara: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2008

Tekerek, Meltem. *12 Eylül Askeri Müdahalesi ve Ekonomi Politikaları* MA Thesis, Ankara University 2012.

Tezel, Yahya S. *Cumhuriyet Döneminin İktisadi Tarihi (1923-1950).* Ankara: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1982

Timur, Taner. *Türkiye de Çok Partili Hayata Geçiş.* İstanbul: İmge Kitabevi Yayınları, 2003.

Toprak, Zafer. "Türkiye Tarımı ve Yapısal Gelişmeler," in *Türkiye'de Tarımsal Yapılar (1923-2008), ed., Şevket Pamuk and Zafer Toprak*, 19-37, Ankara: Yurt Yayınları, 2008.

Topuz, Hüseyin." Cumhuriyet Ekonomisinde Tarımsal Yapının İncelenmesi (1923-1950)," *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi* 12, no. 3 (2007): 367-380

Turgut, Serdar. *Demokrat Parti Döneminde Türkiye Ekonomisi Ekonomik Kalkınma Süreçleri Üzerine Bir Deneme*. Ankara: Adalet Matbaacılık, 1991.

Uca, Alaatin. "İkinci Dünya Savaşı Yıllarında Türkiye'nin Altı Vilayetinde İlan Edilen Örfi İdare ve Buna Karşı Mecliste Gösterilen Demokratik Tepki" *Atatürk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Dergisi,* no. 40, (2009): 375-390

Varlı, Arzu."Devletçilik Politikalarının Tarım Kesmi Üzerindeki Etkileri (1930-1940)" *Marmara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Öneri Dergisi* 10, no. 38, (2012): 113-124.

Varlı, Arzu and Oktar, Suat. "Türkiye'de 1950-1954 Döneminde Demokrat Partinin Tarım Politikası"*Marmara Üniversitesi İİBF Dergisi* 28*,* no.1 (2010): 1-22.

Yalçın, Osman. "İkinci Dünya Savaşında İsmet İnönü ve Churchil Arasında Yapılan Adana Görüşmesi" *Ankara Üniversitesi Türk İnkılap Tarihi Enstitüsü Atatürk Yolu Dergisi*, no.47 (Spring 2011): 701-731.

Yaşar, Okan. "Edirne İlinin Nüfus Hareketleri Bakımından İncelenmesi ve Son Dönemde Göçlere Katılanların Sosyo-ekonomik Nitelikleri "*Doğu Coğrafya Dergisi* 14, no. 21 (2009): 195-220.

Yerasimos, Stefanos. *Az Gelişmişlik Sürecinde Türkiye.* Translated by Babür Kuzucu. İstanbul: Gözlem Yayınevi, 1976.

Newspaper Articles

Kaskatı, Arif Necip. "Örnek Bir Cumhuriyet Köyü Buldum." *Edirne Postası*, 23 February 1946.

Oktay, Abidin. "Edirne'de Hayat Pahalılığı." *Edirne Postası,* 05 June 1940.

"Avrupa Trenleri Ancak Dünden İtibaren işletmeye Açılabildi." *Edirne Postası,* 28 January 1955.

"Askerde Olan Çiftçiye de Toprak Verilecek." *Edirne Postası,* 14 December 1954

"418 Aileye 10.511 Dönüm Toprak Dağıtıldı." *Yeni Edirne*, 16 June 1951.

"Bağ Yetiştireceklere Kolaylık." *Edirne Postası,* 21June1947.

"Batı Trakya 'da Türk Köylerinin Tasfiyesi." *Vatandaş Gazetesi,* 29 April 1957

"Batı Trakya'da Yunan Baskısı Tahammül Edilemez Bir Hal Aldı." *Edirne Postası,* 8 August1957

"Belediyenin Etiketi Olmayan Unların Satışı YasakEdildi."*Edirne Postası*, 30 February 1939.

Beyanaata Tabi Mallar Ancak Vesikalara Dayanılarak Satılabilecek." *Edirne Postası,* 10 June 1955.

"Bir Çeşit Ekmek Çıkarılacak." *Edirne Postası,*12 February 1941.

"Böcekçi." *Edirne Postası*, 14 May 1942.

"Böcekçilik Kursu İşe Başladı." *Edirne Postası*, 15 March 1939.

"1947 Buğday Bütçesi Meclise Verildi." *Edirne Postası*, 05 January 1946.

"Buğday Fiyatları Her yerde Aynı Olacak."*Edirne Postası*, 14 December 1940.

"Buğdayı Koruma Vergisinin Kaldırıması Kabul Edildi." *Edirne Postası,* 1 April1942.

"Buğday Satışlarını Devlet Murakabası Altına Aldı." *Edirne Postası*,14 December 1940.

"Bulgar Köylerinde Kargaşalar Başladı." *Edirne Postası,* 24 Ağustos 1949.

"Bu Yıl İçme Suyuna Kavuşacak Olan Köylerimiz Tespit Ediliyor." *Vatandaş Gazetesi,* 12 March 1957

"Bu Yıl Mahsulümüz Çok Bereketli Olacak." *Edirne Postası,* 31 May1955.

"Çeltik Ekimi," *Edirne Postası,* 10 May 1957.

"Çeltik Ekimi için Hazırlanan Tasarı Büyük Millet Meclisi Encümenlerince Müzkerelerine Başlandı." *Edirne Postası,* 9 February 1955.

"Çeltik Ziraatımız Dörtte Üç Nispetinde Azalmaya Maruzdur." *Yeni Edirne Gazetesi*, 18 April 1955.

"Çeteciler Hududumuza yakın Yunan Köylerine Taaruza Başladılar," *Edirne Postası,* 21June 1947.

"Çiftçilere ve Göçmenlere Mikyasta Yardım Edilecek." *Edirne Postası*, 25 November 1939.

"Çiftçilere Kredi." *Edirne Postası*, 31 August 1950.

"Çiftçiye Kredi." *Edirne Postası*, 21 Aralık 1959.

"Çiftçiye Tohumluk Veriliyor." *Edirne Postası,* 21 Ekim 1950.

"Çiftçiyi Topraklandırma Nizamnamesi Yürürlüğe Girdi." *Edirne Postası,* 29 March1957.

"Çiftçiye Tohumluk," *Edirne Postası*, 21 March1939.

"Çiftçiye Tohumluk." *Edirne Postası* 12 November 1947.

"Çiftçiye Toprak Dağıtılıyor," *Edirne Postası*, 7 July1948.

"Çiftçiye Yapılan Yardımlar." *Edirne Postası* 12January 1944.

"Çiftçiye Yardım." *Edirne Postası*, 2 June1948.

"Çiftçiye Yardım İçin Yeni Kanun Tasarısı." *Edirne Postası,* 10 July 1948.

"Çiftçiye Zirai Alet Verilecek." *Edirne Postası,* 19 February 1949.

"Demiryolu İnşaatı Programında Trakya." *Edirne Postası,* 10 February1946.

"DP İlçe Kongresi Dilekleri." *Yeni Edirne Gazetesi,* 25 April 1952.

"Edirne'nin Ekmek İşi." *Edirne Postası*, 2 April 1941.

"Edirne'nin Ekonomik ve Ticari Bakımdan Dert ve Dileklerini Tespit Etti." *Edirne Postası*, 24 August 1949.

"Edirne'nin Her Bakımdan Kalkınması İçin Ne Gibi Esaslı Tedbirler Alınmış Bulunuyor." *Edirne Postası*, 25 June 1949.

"Edirne'mizin Ezeli Derdi: Ekmek." *Edirne Postası,* 15 July 1953.

"Edirne İstanbul Yolu İnşaatı Hızla İlerliyor." *Edirne Postası,* 2 March1939

"Edirne'nin Kalkınması." *Edirne Postası,* 28 December 1949.

"Edirne Milletvekilleri Köyleri Gezdiler." *Edirne Postası,* 3 November 1948.

"Edirne, Musabeyli, Demirhanlı, Hacıumur, Geçkinli, Süloğlu Yolu İnşaatı İlerliyor." *Vatandaş Gazetesi*, 14 May 1958.

"Edirneli Gençler Ne Zaman Söz Sahibi Olacak" *Edirne Postası*, 10 February 1955.

"Edirne Su Baskınına Uğradı." *Edirne Postası*, 27 January 1947.

"Edirne Su Baskınına Uğradı," *Edirne Postası* 29 January 1947.

"Edirne'de Un ve Ekmek Sıkıntısı Kalmadı." *Edirne Postası*, 25 October 1940.

"Edirnelinin Yiyecek Bir Lokma Nefis Ekmekten Mahrumiyeti Doğru mu?"*Edirne Postası,* 1 August 1953.

"Edirne'nin Zirai Kalkınması ve Çeltik Ziraati Hakkında Bazı Yeni Kararlar Alındı." *Edirne Postası,* 1 April 1953

"Ekmek Buhranı mı ?" *Edirne Postası,* 7 August 1940.

"Ekmek İstihkakı Yarın Arttırılıyor." *Edirne Postası,* 17 January 1945.

"Ekmek Meselesi Mevcut mudur?" *Edirne Postası,* 28 February 1939

"Ekmek Niçin Ucuzlamıyor?" *Edirne Postası* ,15 February 1939.

"El Tezgahları Faaliyete Geçti," *Edirne Postası*, 12 February 1941.

"Enez'in Bugünkü Çok Acıklı Hali." *Edirne Postası*, 24 December 1955.

"Enez Yoluna Başlanıyor." *Vatandaş Gazetesi*, 27 April 1957.

"Enez Yolu da Devlet Yolu Oldu." *Hizmet Gazetesi*, 14 April 1959.

"Ergene ve Meriç." *Edirne Postası*, 19 April 1950.

"Ergene Ovası Sular Altnda." *Edirne Postası*,13 January 1955.

"Et Kesimi Niçin Azaldı?" *Edirne Postası*, 21 January 1957.

"Gitmek İçin Hiçbir Mecburiyet Yoktur Yalnız Arzuya Bağlıdır." *Edirne Postası,* 21 April 1941.

"Göçmen Evinde Neler Gördüm" *Edirne Postası,* 15January 1950.

"Halk Evimiz Çalışıyor." *Edirne Postası,* 25 May1940.

"Havsalıların Dilekleri." *Yeni Edirne Gazetesi* ,18 December 1951.

"Havsalıların Dilekleri." *Yeni Edirne Gazetesi,* 18 December 1951.

"Hayat Pahalılığı." *Edirne Postası,* 20 December 1942.

"Hayat Pahalılığnı Önlemek İçin Geniş ve Cezri Tedbirler Alınıyor." *Edirne Postası,* 23 September 1953.

"Hudut Değişikliği Yapılması Zaruri Görülüyor." *Edirne Postası*, 29 January 1957.

"Hükümet Hasada Başlamak Üzere Tedbirler Aldı." *Edirne Postası,* 14 June 1941.

"İktisadi Birer Can Damarı Olan Yol İnşaatına Hız Verildi."*Edirne Postası*, 4 June1940.

"İlmi Sevki İdarenin Türkiye'de Tatbiki İçin Hazırlanan Plan." *EdirnePostası,* 10 January 1951.

"İpek Böcekçiliği Kursu." *Edirne Postası*, 19 April 1950.

"İpek Böcekçiliği ve Kozacılık Kalkındırılacak." *Yeni Edirne Gazetesi,* 7 July 1954.

"İpsala'da Toprak Dağıtımı." *Hizmet Gazetesi,* 1 January1959.

"İpsala Ovasındaki Köprüler Yapılıyor." *Vatandaş Gazetesi*, 3 November 1948.

"İpsala İbriktpe Yolu Yapılıyor." *İpsala Gazetesi,* 1 September 1956.

"İstanbul Selanik Yolu İnşaatına Devam." *Edirne Postası*, 27 April1956.

"İstanbul Londra Asfalt Yolu İnşaatı Hızla İlerlemekte." *Edirne Postası,* 13 August 1956

"Kahve Geldi." *Edirne Postası,* 24 December 1955.

"Kahvehaneler Niçin Çoğalıyor." *Edirne Postası*, 10 February 1955.

"Kahraman Orduya Edirne'nin Hediyesi." *Edirne Postası,* 14 December 1940.

"Kahraman Askerlerimize Edirnelilerin Hediyesi." *Edirne Postası*, 2 November 1940.

"Karaborsacılık ve İhtikarla Savaş İçin Hazırlıklar Yapılıyor." *Edirne Postası*, 3 October 1953.

"Karne ile Şeker Dağıtılmaya Başlandı." *Edirne Postası*, 7 July 1948

"Karpuz, Kavun Çok Bol." *Edirne Postası,* 8 August 1955.

"Keşan ve Havalisinde Zirai Vaziyet İyidir." *Edirne Postası*, 4 June 1940.

"Keşan'da Toprak Dağıtımı." *Edirne Postası,* 16 July 1955

"Kırkpınar ve Edirne." *Edirne Postası*, 7 May 1949

"Kız ve Erkek Sanat Enstitülerine Bağlı Köy Kursları Sergileri Açıldı." *Edirne Postası,* 8 May 1954.

"Kızılay Kurumunun Edirne Seylabzedelerine Çok Kıymetli Yardımları Devam Ediyor."

"Kozalar Kurutulacak."*Edirne Postası*, 31 May1944.

" Köylerde Açılacak Halk Kursları." *Edirne Postası,* 30 March 1955.

"Köylere Hakikati Götürecek Olan Yayım Programının Tatbiki." *Edirne Postası,* 16 December 1950.

"Köylerimizde Sanat Kursları Açılıyor." *Edirne Postası*, 20 April 1940.

"Köylüye Tohumluk Tevziatı Başlıyor." *Yeni Edirne Gazetesi,* 29 September 1950.

"Köylüye Toprak " *Yeni Edirne Gazetesi,* 21 August 1950.

"Köy Topraklarına Ait Bir Açıklama." *Edirne Postas,ı* 6 May 1954.

"Köy Yolları ve Finansmanı." *Vatandaş Gazetesi,* 15 December 1948.

"Köy Yolları İnşaatı." *Yeni Edirne Gazetesi*, 4 April 1952.

"Kuzu Eti Ucuzladı" *Edirne Postası,* 26 March 1955.

"Lalapaşa'da DP Faaliyeti Arttı." *Yeni Edirne Gazetesi,* 15 February 1952

"Lalapaşa'da Yeni Bir Silo Yapılıyor." *Edirne Postası,* 29 March 1957.

"1943 Mahsulü Çok Feyizli." *Edirne Postası,* 12 January 1944.

"1954 Mahsulü," *Edirne Postası,* 6 January1955.

"Mandıralar Faaliyete Geçti." *Edirne Postası,* 01 April1942.

"Marshall Planı Türkiye İdresi Başkanı Russel Dorr Diyor ki." *Edirne Postası*, 16 December 1950.

"Meriç DP İlçe Kongresi Dilekleri." *Yeni Edirne Gazetesi*, 8 May 1954.

"Meriç DP İlçe Kongresi Yapıldı." *Edirne Postası,* 20 February 1953.

"Meriç ve Ergene Ovalarının Islahı." *Yeni Edirne Gazetesi,* 29 June 1952.

"Meriç Küplü Yolu." *Vatandaş Gazetesi*, 29 April 1957.

"Meriç Nehrinin Islah İşi. "*Yeni Edirne Gazetesi,* 18 April 1955.

"Meriç Nehrinin Islah İşi Harza Engineering Kumpanyasına Devredildi." *Yeni Edirne Gazetesi,* 18 March 1952.

"Meriç ve Tunca Nehrleri Yatağının Islah ve Temizlenmesi İşi için Hazırlıklara Başlandı," *Edirne Postası,* 23 March1955.

"Meriç ve Kollarının Temizleme ve Islahı Ameliyesine Yarın Başlanıyor," *Edirne Postası*, 31 May 1955.

"Meriç Nehri Yatağının Islahı." *Yeni Edirne Gazetesi,* 19 September 1950.

"Meriç Nehri Yatağının Islahı ve Temizlenmesi Hususndaki Müzakereler Müsbet Neticelendi," *Edirne Postası,* 10 Ferbruary 1955.

"Meriç Sahillerinde İnşaat Devam Ediyor." *Edirne Postası,* 18 February 1939.

"Meriç Nehri'nin Yatağı Islah Ediliyor." *İpsala Gazetesi*, 18 April1955.

"Meriç Yatağı Islah Edilecek." *Edirne Postası,* 16 December 1950.

"Meyvecilik Kursları Açıldı."*Yeni Edirne Gazetesi,* 5 March 1954.

"Milli Korunma Ölüm Korkusuyla Mümkündür." *Edirne Postası,* 12 January 1944.

"Milli Korunma Kanununun Zirai Kısımları Tatbik Edilecek." *Edirne Postası,* 11 May 1940.

"Nehirlerin Temizlenmesi Yakında Başlıyor," *Edirne Postası*, 11 March 1955.

"Motorlu Trenlerin Tecrübesi Başladı." *Edirne Postası,* 4 August 1955

"Muhtaç Çiftçilerimize Tohumluk Yardımı." *Edirne Postası,* 17September 1955.

"Ofis Trakya'dan Hububat Alıyor." *Edirne Postası,* 29 September 1955

"Pancar Sökümü Başladı." *Edirne Postası,* 31 May 1944.

"Pazar Yeri İsteniyor." *Edirne Postası,* 8 February 1939.

"Peynir Buhranını Kaşar Yokluğu Takip Etti." *Edirne Postası* ,01April 1941.

"Pehlivan Köy Edirne Tren Hattı İçin Hazırlıklara Başlandı." *İpsala Gazetesi*, 3 October 1956.

"Sebze ve Meyve Çok Pahalı." *Edirne Postası,* 8 July1955.

"Seddeler Natamam Olmasına Rağmen İmtihanı Başarı İle Vermiş." *Edirne Postsı,* 16 February1956.

"Sekiz Yeni Selektör Getiriliyor."*Edirne Postası*, 18 January 1939.

"Sıtma Kaynaklarının Kökü Kurulmak Üzere Sağlık ve Köy İdareleri İşbirliği Yapacak." *Edirne Postası*, 2 April 1941.

"Sineklerle Mücadele." *İpsala Gazetesi,* 8 June 1955.

"Son Senelerde Zirai İstihsalimiz Makineleşti." *Edirne Postası*, 7 November1953.

"Su Baskınına Uğrayanlara Yardım Ediliyor." *Edirne Postası*, 26 January 1954.

"Suların Taşmasıyla Her Sene Büyük Zarar Açan Meriç Nehri Mecrasının Temizlenmesi İşi Ne Olacak." *Edirne Postası*, 17 May 1954.

"Sürekli Yağışlar Neticasinde Birçok Yeri Seller Bastı." *Edirne Postası,*17 December 1954.

"Şehirde Ekmek Neden Bulunamıyor?" *Edirne Postası,* 28 August 1940.

"Şeker Fiyatı İnecek mi?" *Edirne Postası,* 13 May1950.

"Şeker Satışı." *Edirne Postası,* 23 March 1955.

"Şeker Sıkıntısı Acaba Kalkcak mı?" *Edirne Postası*, 10 February 1955.

"Şeker Sıkıntısı Aldı Yürüdü." *Edirne Postası*, 19 June 1948.

"Şimendifer Hattının İşlemeye Açılışında Mahzur Yoktur." *Edirne Postası,* 21 January1948.

"Tarım Bakanlığı Yirmi Kurs Açacak." *Yeni Edirne Gazetesi,* 4 March 1952.

"Tarım Kredi Kooperatifleri İkrazata Başladı." *Vatandaş Gazetesi,* 3 November 1948.

"Tarımın Modernleşmesi." *Edirne Postası*, 10 March1951.

"Tarihi ve Meşhur Kırkpınar Güreşlerine Dün Başlandı." *Edirne Postası*, 17 May 1945.

"Temcit Pilavı." *Edirne Postası*, 21 January 1948.

"Toprak Mahsulleri Ofisi Trakya'da Pirinç Mübayaasına Hız Verdi." *İpsala Gazetesi*, 23 March 1955.

"Toprak Mahsulleri Vergisi İçin Beyanname Mecburiyeti." *Edirne Postası* 11 June1943.

"Toprak Mahsulleri Vergisi Nasıl Alınacak ?" *Edirne Postası,* 11 June 1943.

"Topraksız Çiftçiye Toprak Dağıtımı." *Edirne Postası,* 12 January1944.

"Topraksız Köylüye Üç Milyon Dekar Toprak Dağıtılacak." *Edirne Postası*, 22 December 1954.

"Trakyamızda Açılan Selektör İstasyonları Çiftçmize Faydalı Oluyor." *Edirne Postası,* 4 April 1939.

"Trakya'da Bağcılık." *Edirne Postası*, 22 March 1939.

"Trakya Çeltikçiler Derneği Kuruldu." Vatandaş Gazetesi, 29 September 1950.

"Trakya Çeltik Komisyonları Toplantısı." *Edirne Postası,* 26 February1957.

"Trakya'da Ekim ve Hayvancılık İşleri." *Edirne Postası,* 3 October 1945.

"Trakya'da Kırkpınar Güreşleri Hazırlığı Tamamlandı." *Edirne Postası,* 9 May 1950.

"Trakya da Kozacılık. "*Edirne Postası*, 6 January 1946

"Trakya Kozacılığı İnkışafta." *Edirne Postası*, 22 February 1939.

"Trakya'da Mahsul Umumiyetle İyidir." *Edirne Postası*, 10 August 1949.

"Trakya'da Meriç Nehri Mecrası Marshall Yardımı İle Tanzim Edilecek." *Edirne Postası,* 10 March 1951.

"Trakya Panayırları." *Edirne Postası,* 10 July 1948.

"Trakya Panayırları." *Edirne Postası,* 7 May 1949.

"Trakya'da Pancar Müstahsilleri Başvekile Müracaat Etti." *Vatandaş Gazetesi*, 1 January 1958.

"Trakya'da Sıtma Mücdelesi." *Edirne Postası*, 16 June 1941.

"Trakya Türklerine Baskı Artıyor." *Vatandaş Gazetesi,* 12 July 1957.

"Trakyamızda Zirai Kalkınma." *Edirne Postası,* 22 February 1939.

"Trakyamızda Zirai Kalkınma."*Edirne Postası,* 2 March 1939.

"Trakya da Ziraat Bu Sene Çok Bereketli." *Edirne Postası,* 14 June 1946.

"Tren Yolcularının Gümrük Muayeneleri Devam ediyor."*Edirne Postası*, 26 February 1957.

"Türkiye'de Çeltik İstihsali ve İpsala." *Vatandaş Gazetesi*, 28 September 1948.

"Türkiye İpek Böcekçiliği Enstitüsünden Beklentilerimiz." *Edirne Postası,* 25 June 1949.

"Türkiye'de Sıtma İle Mücadele Şiddetleniyor." *Edirne Postası,* 21 October 1950.

"Türkiye'de Tarım Sayımı ve Hedefi." *Edirne Postası,* 18 October 1950.

"Türkiye'de Toprağın İlk İlmi Etüdü." *Edirne Postası* ,31 June1953.

"Türkiye Yolları ve Planlı Çalışmalar." *Edirne Postası,* 24 March 1951.

"Türkiye'de Yol Programının Muhtelif Cepheleri." *Edirne Postası,* 24 March 1951.

"Uzunköprü DP Ocak Kongreleri Hızla Devam Ediyor." *Edirne Postası*, 3February 1953.

"Uzunköprü Demokrat Parti Merkez İlçesi Dilekleri." *Yeni Edirne Gazetesi,* 25 April 1952.

"Uzunköprü'den Haberler." *Edirne Postası,* 24 December 1949

"Uzunköprü Hamidiye Harmanlı Yolu." *Yeni Edirne Gazetesi*, 9 October 1951.

"Uzunköprü'de Kalkınma." *Edirne Postası,* 6 May 1957

"Uzunköprü 'de Muhtaç Çiftçiye Toprak Dağıtımı Devam Ediyor." *Edirne Postası,* 29 September 1957.

"Uzunköprü'nün Su İşi." *Edirne Postası,* 10 March 1948.

"Uzunköprü'de Toprak Dağıtımı." *Edirne Postası,* 4 August 1955.

"Uzunköprü'de Tohumluk Tevzi." *Yeni Edirne Gazetesi,* 20 March 1953.

"Uzunköprü'de Yeni Borsa Binası Yapılıyor." *İpsala Gazetesi,* 3 October 1956.

"Uzunköprü'de Yeni Faaliyetler." *Yeni Edirne Gazetesi* 9 October 1951.

"Valimizin Köy Tetkikleri." *Edirne Postası*, 11 June1943.

"Valimiz Mülhakatta." *Edirne Postası,* 31 May 1944.

"Vilayetimizde Bu Yıl Dağıtılan Toprak ve Mera." *İpsala Gazetesi,* 10 December 1955.

"Vilayetimizde Hayvancılık Çalışmaları." *Hizmet Gazetesi*, 4 May 1959.

"Yeni Bir Kooperatif." *Edirne Postası*, 28 January 1955.

"1958 Yılında İçme Suyuna Kavuşan Köylerimiz."*Hizmet Gazetesi,* 20 October 1958.

"1955 Yılı Şeker Pancarı Fiyatları Yenden Tespit ve İlan Edildi." *Edirne Postası,* 23 March 1955.

"Yolcuların Gümrük Muayenesine Tabi Tutulmaları." *Edirne Postası*, 15 February1957.

"Yunanistan Türk Azınlığı Baskı Altında Cemaat Seçimleri Yaptı." *Edirne Postası,* 25 May 1957.

"Yunan Hududunda Vuku Bulan Haidsede Bir Yunanlı Öldü." *Edirne Postası*, 22 September1960.

"Ziraat Bankamız." *Edirne Postası* 12 February 1941.

"Zirai Koordinasyon Çalışmaları." *Edirne Postası*, 23 June1954.

"Ziraatin Planlı Makineleşmesi." *Edirne Postası,* 14 March 1951.

"Ziraat Vekaletine 1941 Hububatına El Koyma Salahiyeti Verildi." *Edirne Postası,* 9 July 1941.

"Ziraat Vekaleti 1100 Kutu Böcek Dağıtacak."*Edirne Postası*, 22 March 1939.

.

.

.