

A Statistical Assessment of Izmir and Mersin Ports in the General Commercial Activities of Turkey (1930-1960)

İzmir ve Mersin Limanlarının Türkiye'nin Genel Ticari Faaliyetleri İçerisindeki Yerinin İstatistiksel Olarak Değerlendirilmesi (1930-1960)

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Şengül ŞANLIER
Recep Tayyip Erdoğan Üniversitesi - Rize
Öğr. Gör. Orkun Burak ÖZTÜRK
Recep Tayyip Erdoğan Üniversitesi - Rize

Abstract: Relying on statistical data and archival documents, this study comparatively assesses the significance of two Turkish ports in Izmir and Mersin between 1930 and 1960. As the Ottomans lost many islands to Greece after World War I, the hinterland of Izmir Port, which stretched from Balıkesir and Afyonkarahisar to Konya before WWI, shrank in size but still remained as the second biggest port in Turkey after Istanbul. Since Mersin Port was the sole Turkish port in the Eastern Mediterranean, it preserved its prominence in the early decades of the Turkish republic. This study reveals that in 1930 Turkey's overall exports amounted to 151.454.371 Turkish liras, 28.278.875 of which shipped through Izmir Port and 8.889.000 through Mersin Port. In total these two ports handled 24,5 percent of Turkish export goods. In 1960, the overall export of Turkey amounted to 2.158.466.541 liras. Of this amount, 693.998.121 was shipped through Izmir Port while 183.673.686 was achieved through Mersin Port. Overall, the share of these ports increased from 24,5 percent in 1930 to 40 percent of total exports in 1960.

Keywords: Port of Izmir, Port of Mersin, Commerce, Statistics, Import, Export.

Öz: İstatistik ve arşiv belgelerine dayanarak hazırlanan bu çalışma İzmir ve Mersin limanlarının 1930 ve 1960 yılları arasındaki dönemdeki gelişmelerini karşılaştırmalı olarak incelemektedir. I. Dünya Savaşı öncesinde Balıkesir, Afyonkarahisar ve hatta Konya'ya kadar uzanan İzmir Liman bölgesinde, adaların kaybedilmesinin ardından büyük bir daralma meydana gelmiş ancak bu daralmaya rağmen İzmir Limanı Türk Limanları içerisinde İstanbul'dan sonra ikinci büyük liman olma özelliğini muhafaza etmiştir. Mersin Limanı ise coğrafi konumu itibarı ile Türkiye'nin Doğu Akdeniz'deki yegane limanı olması nedeniyle Cumhuriyetin ilk yıllarından bu yana önemini koruyan bir liman olmuştur. İhracat oranları baz alındığında; 1930 yılında 151.454.371 bin lira olan genel Türkiye ihracatının 28.278.875 bin liralık kısmı İzmir, 8.889.000 bin liralık kısmı ise Mersin Limanı üzerinden gerçekleştirilirken, 1960 yılına gelindiğinde 2.158.466.541 bin lira olan genel ihracatın 693.998.121 bin liralık kısmı İzmir, 183.673.686 bin liralık kısmı ise Mersin Limanı üzerinden yapılmıştır. Genel olarak bu iki liman 1930'da tüm Türkiye ihracatının yüzde 24,5'lik kısmını karşılarken 1960'da toplam ihracatın yüzde 40'ı bu limanlardan yapılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İzmir Limanı, Mersin Limanı, Ticaret, İstatistik, İthalat, İhracat.

Introduction

As Turkey is surrounded by seas, its harbours gained priority treatment in government policies. In order to recover from the economic depression after the War of Independence (1919-1922), the Turkish government passed several navigation regulations and developed various policies. Considering the regulations carried out with that end, the first action was to transfer the duties of the Ottoman Maritime Administration (*Osmanlı Seyr-i Sefain İdaresi*) to



**History
Studies**

Volume 8
Issue 2
June
2016

the organization established with the title of the “Turkish Maritime Administration” as per the “Law on Maritime Administration” dated 4 April 1923 and numbered 547. With this transfer, the available opportunities in navigation were solidified and freight shipment was systematized even if only partially.¹ As for the second action, it was the regulation known as the Cabotage Law, which is also called the Law Concerning Coastal Shipping (Cabotage) Along Turkish Shores and Performance of Trade and Business in Turkish Ports and Territorial Waters dated 20 April 1926 and numbered 815. With this regulation, it was indicated that the activities that were allowed to only foreign people in the past became exclusive only to the citizens of the Republic of Turkey with this statement “*The pilotage and tug services besides the transportation of goods and passengers between Turkish harbours and coasts are carried out by Turkish Citizens and the ships hoisting Turkish flag.*”² Though the cabotage right was acquired with this law that took effect in 1926, it became possible to exercise the right only after the Treaty of Lausanne.³ The third legal regulation that was found striking at this time was that Turkish ship owners were provided the conditions of equal competition with the state sector through the Law for the Encouragement of Industry (*Teşvik-i Sanayi Kanunu*). When this law is investigated, it is seen that ship owners were exempt from taxes and custom expenses besides being allowed to get an advance and loan. Although capitulations were abolished and efforts were made to nationalize and improve the entire navigation system in the aftermath of the First World War, the Turkish merchant marine consisted of only a 35.000-ton fleet because its ships had been damaged seriously in the time of war.⁴

The economic depression felt after the years of the War of Independence made it necessary to make new economic policies and new regulations. On one hand, the government supported production in order to meet the fundamental needs of citizens and on the other hand, it began to take serious measures in order to bring to an end to the country’s foreign dependence. With that end, Turkey aimed to nationalize the areas with economic importance.⁵ The Republican regime nationalized harbour authorities in order to liberate them from foreign countries as in other areas such as Turkish Post (PTT), Turkish State Railways (TCDD) and State Airports Authority. İzmir and Mersin Harbours were also among those important harbours that were nationalized. For this purpose, the administration and authority of İzmir Harbour was taken over from the company run by *Uşakizade Muammer Bey* on 30 June 1925 and transferred to Harbour and Gulf Agency of İzmir.⁶ Similarly, the authority of Mersin Harbour that was operated by Gruenblat Company during French occupation was transferred to Turkish Mersin Harbour Works Monopoly Corporation for 30 years by the Ministry of Commerce (*Ticaret Vekaleti*) on 27 May 1927.⁷

Another important indicator of the efforts to create a national economic consciousness was the establishment of the Higher Council of Economy (*Âli İktisat Meclisi*)⁸ as an extension

¹ Filiz Çolak, “A General Overview of the Transportation Policy of the Turkish Republic in the Atatürk Era”, *Turkish Studies*, 8/2, Winter 2013, p.357.

² Cahit İstikbal, “Turkish Straits: Difficulties and Role of Pilotage” *SeaNews*, 03 November 2015. <http://www.denizhaber.com/turk-bogazlari-makale,100974.html> (Accessed: 05.15.2016).

³ Çolak, A General Overview of..., p.358.

⁴ Çolak, A General Overview of..., p.357.

⁵ Sinan Demirbilek, “Monopolies in the One-Party System”, *Çttad*, 12/24, Spring 2012, p. 205.

⁶ Demirbilek, *Monopolies in the One-Party System...*, p.216.

⁷ Demirbilek, *Monopolies in the One-Party System...*, p.215.

⁸ Higher Council of Economy was a formation that was not exclusive to Turkey but similar formations were also present in France, Germany, Italy, Poland, England, Spain and Greece. Fehmi Akın-Serkan Bayraktar, "One of the Economic Foundations of Early Republican Period: Higher Council of Economy, *Dumlupınar University Social Sciences Journal*, No 29, April 2011, p. 115-116. Özlem Yakıtı-Perihan Ünlü Soylu, "A Leading Advisory Board on the Way to Economic Development: Higher Council of Economy", *Ankara University- Institute of Turkish*



JHS
110

History
Studies

Volume 8
Issue 2
June
2016

of “Economic Council (*İktisadiyat Meclisi*)” which had been created by the Party of Union and Progress (*İttihat ve Terakki*) in 1917.⁹ The Higher Council of Economy was established in order to support liberal economic policies and to invigorate the economy which had deteriorated after the war. It was an organisation affiliated to the prime ministry in line with a law consisting of 14 articles.¹⁰ The primary duties of this association, which also served as an advisory board, was to provide opinions concerning economic laws and draft regulations to be created by the government, to present the changes that it considered necessary in economic legislation, in the form of a proposal with justifications, to conduct research about the economic needs of Turkey and to investigate various economic movements across the world, study their relation to the Turkish economy and the degree of influence that they had on Turkey.¹¹

One of the subjects on the agenda of the meeting that the Higher Council of Economy held on 15-29 December 1931 was Turkish Harbours, and this Council investigated the “harbour services in Turkey and the measures that would serve for the development of Turkish Harbours”. Beforehand, a comprehensive survey was carried out across the offices, organizations and formations relevant to the existing harbours by the Secretary General of the time in order to lay the basis for the investigation. In this survey where harbours were handled as an economic issue, there were 3 main titles¹²: the connection between Turkish harbours and other harbours, transit destinations and the amount of transit that was performed.

In the report of the Higher Council of Economy, the harbours having crucial hinterlands in the Mediterranean were indicated as İzmir and Mersin Harbours with the following statement: “*The importance of harbours with regards to maritime trade is measured according to their hinterlands.*”¹³ In the report, it was pointed that the Harbour of İzmir had a wide hinterland stretching from Balıkesir to Afyon and to the islands before World War I, but this hinterland became narrow in the aftermath of the war as the islands had been lost. However this Turkish Harbour was still the second most important. In the report of the Higher Council of Economy, it was stated that the hinterland of Mersin Harbour described as “*The only Turkish harbor in eastern Mediterranean*” widened especially after the excavation of the Toros and Amanos tunnels and the construction of Fevzi Pasha-Malatya Line and thus it reached an extent to accommodate an entire harbor. It is also indicated in the report that the area from Mersin-Haydarpaşa Line to Konya; Mersin-Nusaybin and Mersin-Malatya Lines, Maraş, Antep, Malatya, Elazığ, Urfa, Mardin and Diyarbakır were also included in the hinterland of Mersin Harbour and thus it became a very important center of commerce.¹⁴

In the report, the situations of the Harbours of İzmir and Mersin before and after World War I were investigated in detail. It was understood that the trading volume of İzmir Harbour gradually increased in the years before the war; the tonnage that was 1.566 million in 1900 increased to 2.890 million in 1909 which means that it grew by 58%.¹⁵ When the first five

Revolution History, Journal of Atatürk Yolu, No 47, Spring 2011, p. 680. Murat Koraltürk, "Âli İktisat Meclisi (Higher Council of Economy) (1927-1935)", *Economic Approach*, 7/23, 1996, p. 47.

⁹ Şengül Karadeniz - Zehra Arslan, "The Situation of Ports in Turkey during Early 1930s According to Report of Higher Council of Economy Dated as 15-29 December 1931", *Turkish Studies*, 8/12, Fall 2013, p.651.

¹⁰ RG (Official Gazette of Republic of Turkey) In the 1st article of the Law numbered 1170, it was indicated that there would be 24 members and a secretary in the organization of the council. *Resmi Gazete*, No, 640, 24 July 1927, p. 2901. Akin-Bayraktar, One of the Economic Foundations..., p. 117.

¹¹ Yaktı-Soylu, A Leading Advisory Board..., p. 681.

¹² BCA (Primer Ministry Archive of Republic), Higher Council of Economy Report, 030.01.00.00.39.233.11.3.

¹³ BCA, 030.01.00.00.39.233.11.7.

¹⁴ BCA, 030.10.00.00.27.153.2.61.

¹⁵ BCA, 030.10.00.00.27.153.2.56.



JHS

111

History
StudiesVolume 8
Issue 2
June
2016

years just after the war were investigated, it was seen that shipping tonnage remained almost the same in 1926-1930 as it was 1,913 million in 1926 and 1.843 million in 1930—it never reached the level that it had in the years before the war.¹⁶ As for the investigation on the amount of export in Mersin Harbour before and after the War, it was seen that the export volume of 60.047 tonnes in 1912 was almost set to zero during the wartime and it became possible to reach this level again only in 1930.¹⁷

Mersin and Izmir Harbours between 1930 and 1945

Between 1930 and 1938, statist industrialization policies were carried out in the country in order to alleviate the effects of the economic depression that started in 1929 and spread to the whole world. At this time, the most important progress was the effectualizing of the First 5-Year Industry Plan that was considered to be the first industrialization movement in Turkey, on 17 April 1934.¹⁸ The striking point about this plan was that it adopted an approach that required producing fundamental needs within the country, it did not allow importation of raw materials unless really necessary nor export of home products at low prices. The content of the plan was determined with the purpose of establishing factories in different industries such as textiles, mining, paper, ceramics and chemicals while agriculture and navigation—the fields that were leading the state economy—were not included within the scope of the plan.¹⁹

When the general situation of Turkish harbours in 1930s was investigated, it was striking that there were several important problems across all of the nation's harbours. Especially in terms of technical problems, it can be said that the harbor area and docks were narrow²⁰; the number and capacity of loading and discharging equipment were not sufficient and the personnel employed in harbours were showing arbitrary behavior.²¹ Also, the fact that the goods on ships which were used for commercial activities were opened arbitrarily at harbours and were subject to such problems as smuggling and theft which disturbed the owners of goods and the carrier companies. Additionally, perfunctory procedures that went beyond their purpose and the harbor expenses that were considerably high in comparison to those in foreign countries deterred international ships from touching at Turkish harbours.²²

When the legal regulations aimed for the resolution of these problems were examined, the first one was a part of the Turkish Commercial Law dated 15 May 1929, concerning maritime

¹⁶ BCA, 030.10.00.00.27.153.2.57.

¹⁷ BCA, 030.10.00.00.27.153.2.64.

¹⁸ Fikret Yücel, *Industrialization History of the Republic of Turkey (Cumhuriyet Türkiye'sinin Sanayileşme Öyküsü)*, Türkiye Teknoloji Geliştirme Vakfı (TTGV), Ankara 2015, p.36.

¹⁹ Yücel, *Industrialization History of the Republic of Turkey*, p. 37-41.

²⁰ According to the report of the Higher Council of Economy, İstanbul Harbour had a ship motion of 17 million-ton a year in 1931. Considering that one-square-meter dock was necessary for each 400-500 tons of traffic every year, it was discovered that the dock length of İstanbul Harbour didn't meet the need of the time. In the report, this measure was given to be 800 meters in English Harbours, 2000 meters in Liverpool while Russians transacted 1000-tonnes of load annually per each square meter of the dock. It was indicated that an area of at least 30-40 hectares that is 300-400 thousand-meters was needed for dock distances considering the fact that ships increased in size day by day.

²¹ BCA, 030.10.27.153.00.2.

²² It was found that the transactions slowed down or were disrupted since different administrations and organisations were responsible from the crew, load, passengers and equipment of a ship entering the harbour. This was because, agencies had to inform and contact all responsible administrations. For example, İstanbul Directorate of Maritime Trade was responsible for the measures concerning the Cabotage Law and for determining the spot where a vessel could dock while Coast Medical Administration was responsible from the health of crew and passengers; Administration of Customs was responsible for import and export transactions of cargos; Police Administration was responsible from entry-exit transactions of crew and passengers and the Harbour Company was responsible from loading and discharging cargos. Also, if a ship was to enter Black Sea, it had to contact the Maritime Rescue Administration.



JHS
112

History
Studies

Volume 8
Issue 2
June
2016

trade. With this law, a type of administration named “public service” was adopted and the loading-discharging works were left to the control of harbour companies. Thus, the mentioned problems were avoided significantly and the prices paid for loading and discharging were lowered to a normal level. However, the same success could not be achieved in the modernization of loading-discharging equipment at harbours and the expansion of docks. The main reason for this was that navigation was not given sufficient importance in economic policies and it was not included in the First 5-Year Industry Plan. The fact that navigation was ruled out in economics had a reflection on harbours and dock distances could not be extended. As for the resolution of the problems such as smuggling and theft at harbours, the quasi-military “General Command of Customs Enforcement” was set up in 1931 and became successful even if only relatively so.²³

As for the resolution of the problem of foreign ships avoiding Turkish harbours due to high harbour charges, between the years 1932-1935 these charges were reduced significantly. For example, a ship that entered Galata Harbour for import transactions used to be charged 45.106 Lira in 1924 but it was reduced to 25.462 Lira in 1936. Similarly, the amount charged for export operations at harbours was 5,422 Lira in 1924 but was gradually reduced to 571 Lira in 1934.²⁴ Although a serious reduction was made in the prices and harbour charges for ships, the number of international ships entering and exiting all Turkish harbours declined gradually from year to year. This was an indicator that the regulations that were put in place were not effective and could not increase the attractiveness of Turkish harbours.²⁵

When the circumstances of İzmir and Mersin Harbours in 1930-1945 were investigated within the scope of the aforementioned situation, it was seen that the common problems were observed in these 2 harbours as well. It was determined that İzmir Harbour that always became the 2nd biggest harbour among all Turkish Harbours due to being the center for such goods as tobacco, grapes and figs etc. was inadequate in terms of its technical characteristics in the years that were investigated. In fact, large ships used to have difficulty entering-exiting the Harbour because the harbour area was fairly narrow. Also, the depth on the dock border was only 5.5 meters which was not enough for ships to touch at. Therefore, the loading and discharging of commercial goods could only be carried on by using barges.²⁶ As for the equipment available at the harbour, there was not any other equipment except for two hand winches (each weighing four tonnes), a winch of ten tonnes, a floating crane of twenty tonnes and a warehouse belonging to the Railways of Aydın Province.²⁷

²³BCA, 030.10. 27.153.00.2. When the legal regulations before 1930 were investigated, it was seen that “Law on the Prevention and Prosecution of Smuggling” dated 02.06.1929 and numbered 1510 was put into force in order to prevent smuggling. Customs were organized as a separate ministry with the Law dated 30.12.1929, dated 1909 and “Ministry of Customs and Monopolies” was established and assigned the authority and responsibility to fight against smuggling.

²⁴ TÜİK (Prime Ministry State Institute of Statistics), Annual Statistic, 1935-1936, p. 451. Similarly, a ship that imported goods at İstanbul Harbour used to pay 75,262 Lira in 1924 but this amount was reduced to 43.731 in 1934. A ship that exported goods used to pay 3.182 Lira in 1924 but this amount was reduced to 1.549 in 1934. As for a ship that imported goods at İzmir Harbour, it used to pay 118.750 Lira in 1929 but this amount was reduced to 75.213 Lira in 1935. Similarly, ships exporting goods at İzmir Harbour used to pay 101.197 Lira in 1929 but this amount was reduced to 87.483 in 1933.

²⁵ As for the harbour charges in Marmara Region, they were reduced from 4.059 in 1930 to 2.948 in 1934. Similarly, the number of foreign ships entering - exiting the harbours in the Mediterranean declined from 4.315 in 1930 to 3.921 in 1934 whereas the number of ships touching at Black Sea harbours increased. The mentioned discounts led to an obvious change considering the number of foreign ships entering and exiting between 1930 and 1934 as it increased from 567 to 706.

²⁶ BCA, 030.10.00.00.27.153.2.54.

²⁷ BCA, 030.10, 00.00.27.153.2.58.



Having such a commercial importance as to accommodate an entire harbour due to its hinterland, Mersin Harbour used to be considered the most important harbour in Turkey operating in the eastern side of the Mediterranean due to its geographical position. Despite its strategic importance, it had crucial problems: it was under the effect of fierce southwestern winds; it was shallow and did not have structures such as a breakwater or a jetty, thus ships had serious difficulties in touching at this harbour and in loading-discharging operations. The fact that the depth of the dock border was only 2-3 meters made it impossible for ships to touch at the harbour. For this reason, they had to cast anchor in the open sea of 1.200-1.500 meters distance from the dock. Commercial goods used to be carried using barges from this distances which sometimes led to the disappearance of goods with barges before reaching the dock in heavy storms.²⁸ Mersin Harbour had two landing places. The first of these was a Customs landing place of 110 square meters and the second one was a concrete landing place with a length of 150-meters, built in 1927 by the State Railways Administration of the time. There were three electric winches (two of them were two tonnes and one was ten tonnes) on the customs landing place to be used for import operations.²⁹ As for the concrete landing place, there were two steam winches and two electric winches of three tonnes that could move on rails. Also, there was another electric winch of two tonnes on the interior commercial landing place. However, there was no winch on the export landing place, thus commercial goods used to be carried by porters.³⁰

It became possible to give a place to navigation in economic policies with the Second 5-Year Industry Plan under the Presidency of Celal Bayar, who had been the Deputy Minister of Economy in the early 1936 while the First 5-Year Industry Plan was still being implemented. The second plan was more comprehensive in comparison to the first one and unlike the first, it involved agricultural and shipbuilding branches of industry.³¹ Another important development achieved in the field of navigation at this time was the establishment of *Denizbank* with the Law dated 1937 numbered 3295, with the allocation of a capital of 50 million Liras.³² Thus all the formations concerning navigation were taken over by *Denizbank*.³³ However, the investments in all areas including navigation were suspended across the country with the fear that the country could go to war at any moment due to the outbreak of the Second World War and attention was focused only on the defense industry.³⁴

The state economy was negatively affected even though the country did not take part in the Second World War between 1940 and 1945; the import value that was 147.553.703 Lira³⁵ in 1930 declined to 74.815.069³⁶ in 1941, whereas the export value that was 151.454.371 Lira³⁷ declined to 123.080.868 Lira.³⁸ However, it is understood from the Table 1 given below

²⁸ BCA, 030.10, 00.00.27.153.2.59.

²⁹ BCA, 030.10, 00.00.27.153.2.62.

³⁰ BCA, 030.10, 00.00.27.153.2.63.

³¹ Yücel, *Industrialization History of the Republic of Turkey*, p. 41-44.

³² Işıl Sağlam, *Cumhuriyet Gazetesi'ne Göre Türkiye'de Ekonomi-Politik*, (Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Yayınlanmış Yüksek Lisans Tezi), Denizli 2012, p. 168.

³³ With the establishment of Denizbank, all the formations concerning navigation except for the Steamship Company called *Şirket-i Hayriye*, Haliç (*the Golden Horn*) ships and private ships came under the administration of Denizbank. Also, Maritime Lines, Akay, Factories and Pools, İstanbul and İzmir Harbours, Pilotage and Tug Services and the administrations of Van Lake enterprises were transferred to Denizbank with all their capital. Işıl Sağlam

³⁴ Yücel, *Industrialization History of the Republic of Turkey*, p. 44.

³⁵ TÜİK, Annual Statistic, 1930/31, p. 284.

³⁶ TÜİK, Annual Statistic, 1940/41, p. 168.

³⁷ TÜİK, Annual Statistic, 1940/41, p. 284.

³⁸ TÜİK, Annual Statistic, 1940/41, p. 168.



JHS
114

History
Studies

Volume 8
Issue 2
June
2016

that this fall did not last long and the import and export values returned to the levels they had before the war, in 1942.

When the situations in İzmir and Mersin Harbours between 1930 and 1945 are examined statistically, it is understood (from Table 1) that both import and export values declined with each year due to the inadequacies at the harbours. It is seen that the declining import-export values almost hit the bottom during wartime and the import value that was 19.256.000 Lira³⁹ in 1930 declined to 2.706.882 Lira⁴⁰ in 1941, whereas the export values that reached its peak with 84.076.696 Lira⁴¹ in 1935 declined to 27.762.484 Lira⁴² in 1941. A similar situation was observed in the case of Mersin Harbour as well; the most striking reflection of the declining import-export values was felt in the export rates - the export value that was 13.244.000 Lira⁴³ in 1930 declined to 3.042.478 Lira⁴⁴ in 1941 with a contraction of more than 70%.

Table 1. Import - Export Values of Turkish Harbours and İzmir - Mersin Harbours (1930-1945)

Years	İzmir Harbour (lira)		Mersin Harbour (lira)		Turkey (lira)	
	Import	Export	Import	Export	Import	Export
1930	19.256.000	28.278.875	8.889.000	13.244.000	147.553.703	151.454.371
1933	14.376.400	24.957.800	6.789.000	9.244.000	74.675.881	96.161.855
1935	8.249.313	84.076.696	6.344.672	8.970.115	88.823.480	95.861.137
1937	12.522.283	50.396.014	5.777.067	9.942.425	114.379.026	137.988.551
1939	9.615.953	39.450.392	7.787.113	9.527.299	118.248.934	127.388.997
1941	2.706.882	27.762.484	9.682.526	3.042.478	74.815.069	123.080.868
1943	6.114.667	67.098.110	16.634.680	7.635.117	203.045.170	257.151.661
1945	8.114.452	97.948.015	9.631.399	10.226.212	126.166.357	218.928.951

Source: TÜİK Statistics⁴⁵

In Table 2, it is understood that the number of international ships in İzmir and Mersin Harbours, as in all other harbours across the country, declined with each year due to common problems. The number of international ships entering-exiting İzmir Harbour was 771⁴⁶ in 1930 but this figure declined to 635⁴⁷ in 1939 just before the Second World War, whereas 381⁴⁸ foreign ships entered Mersin Harbour in 1930, this number declined to 229⁴⁹ in 1939. It can be said that the declining number of international ships entering-exiting the Turkish harbours almost hit zero in 1941 as an indicator of how deeply the country was affected by the war as

³⁹ TÜİK, Annual Statistic, 1930/31, p. 384-385.

⁴⁰ TÜİK, Annual Statistic, 1941, Part 1. p. 39.

⁴¹ TÜİK, Annual Statistic, 1936/37, V. 9. p. 497.

⁴² TÜİK, Annual Statistic, 1941, Part 1. p. 41.

⁴³ BCA, 030.10.00.00.27.153.2.62.

⁴⁴ TÜİK, Annual Statistic, 1941, Part 1. p. 41.

⁴⁵ TÜİK, Annual Statistic, 1932/33, Volume 6, p. 250/460; TÜİK, Annual Statistic, 1935/36, Volume 8, p. 279-451; TÜİK, Annual Statistic, 1936/37, Volume 9, p. 219-226; TÜİK, Annual Statistic, Commerce Exterior, 1937, Part 3, p. 6; TÜİK, Annual Statistic, Commerce Special, 1939, Part 1, p. 9-42; TÜİK, Annual Statistic, Commerce Special, 1941, Part 1, p. 7-40; TÜİK, Annual Statistic, Commerce Special, 1943, Part 1, p. 21-55; TÜİK, Annual Statistic, Commerce Special, 1946, Part 1, p. 35-80.

⁴⁶ TÜİK, Annual Statistic, 1930/31, p. 399-419.

⁴⁷ TÜİK, Annual Statistic, 1939, Part 1, p. 9; TÜİK, Annual Statistic, 1950, p. 410.

⁴⁸ TÜİK, TÜİK, Annual Statistic, 1950, p. 399-419.

⁴⁹ TÜİK, TÜİK, Annual Statistic, 1950, p. 9.



JHS
115

History
Studies

Volume 8
Issue 2
June
2016

only 17⁵⁰ international ships touched at Mersin Harbour and 55⁵¹ foreign ships touched at İzmir Harbour. When the transactions of national ships at these harbours were investigated and an evaluation was made for İzmir Harbour, no decline whatsoever was found even during wartime. However, when the number of national ships touching at Mersin Harbour was checked, it was surprisingly found that more ships performed commercial transactions at this harbour in 1937-1941 in comparison to the previous years. The main reason that increased the attractiveness of the harbour was the fact that its administration was transferred to the State Railways Administration in 1929. The new administration made an effort to develop the harbour in terms of technical equipment and landing places and the results were reflected positively on the figures.⁵²

Table 2. The Number of National and International Ships Entering - Exiting İzmir and Mersin Harbours (1930-1941).

Years	The Number of National & International Ships Entering - Exiting İzmir Harbour			The Number of National & International Ships Entering - Exiting Mersin Harbour		
	National	International	Total	National	International	Total
1930	2.035	771	2.806	442	381	823
1931	1.697	731	2.428	721	394	1.115
1932	1.619	716	2.335	549	405	954
1933	1.864	817	2.631	437	396	833
1934	1.751	709	2.460	554	300	854
1935	1.822	626	2.448	532	302	834
1936	1.957	633	2.590	813	234	1.047
1937	1.743	686	2.429	1.019	298	1.317
1938	1.785	764	2.549	1.199	274	1.573
1939	1.750	635	2.385	1.278	229	1.507
1940	1.813	238	2.051	1.274	146	1.420
1941	1.800	55	1.855	1.276	17	1293

Source: TÜİK Statistics⁵³

When the goods and products that were imported/exported through İzmir Harbour during this period were categorized, the products that were imported most were all kinds of steel and iron, cotton, cotton yarn, machines, coffee, cocoa, chemical products and medical supplies, whereas the products that were exported most were fruits, tobacco, cereals, oils and leather. As for Mersin Airport, the products that were imported most were all kinds of steel and iron, machines, cotton, coffee, cocoa, tea, cereals, tin, linen and hemp while the products that were exported most were fruits, wool, haircloth and their yarns, simple mines and tree, coal, timber and wood products.⁵⁴

Navigation Works between 1945 and 1960

A period of investment started across the country including in navigation in 1945 when the Second World War ended and continued thereafter. Firstly, it was considered to add new

⁵⁰ TÜİK, Annual Statistic, 1950, Volume 18, p. 396-400.

⁵¹ TÜİK, Annual Statistic, 1950, Volume 18, p. 396-400.

⁵² Demirbilek, Monopolies in the One-Party System..., p.216.

⁵³ TÜİK, Annual Statistic, 1940-1941, p. 599.

⁵⁴ TÜİK, Annual Statistic, Commercial Special, 1930-1945, Parts 3.



JHS
116

*History
Studies*

Volume 8
Issue 2
June
2016

ships to the Turkish fleet and twenty-three ships were bought—seven from the United States, two from Sweden, six from the Netherlands and eight from Italy.⁵⁵ ⁵⁶ Later, both warehouse and entrepot construction works were launched and the necessary orders were given to buy modern mechanical vehicles for harbours in order to resolve the existing inadequacies.⁵⁷ Additionally, negotiations were started with national and international companies in order to ensure that the shipyards that could not meet the needs of the day would be more productive.⁵⁸ Also the construction of a new dock facility was launched in Haliç in addition to the three docks that were unable to meet the docking requirements of the existing fleet.⁵⁹ The requests and problems of ship owners were also attended to besides the work carried out to solve technical problems.⁶⁰ The biggest problem mentioned by ship owners was the provision of long-term loans with low interest. These requests were given priority and the actions to establish Maritime Loan Bank were launched and afterwards, a draft law was prepared in order to open a branch of this bank under the roof of Turkey Mortgage Loan Bank.⁶¹

The General Directorate of Railways and Harbors that was responsible for eliminating shortages in navigation in 1946-1952 allocated a budget of 140.000.000 Lira for this purpose.⁶² 76.000.000 out of this budget was spent only on shipbuilding, construction of factories and harbours⁶³ etc. while with 52.750.000 Lira, it was planned to buy thirty-three ships in total; six

⁵⁵ BCA, 030.10.00.00.14.81.01.3.

⁵⁶ With the contract signed with an Italian company named Ansoldu on 31.10.1946, 6 cargo ships of 5400-gross tonnage and 2 passenger-cargo ships of 2300 gross tonnage were ordered. The Dutch signed 6 contracts for local line ships with a capacity of 1150 passenger and with a value of 8.378.085 on 19.12.1946. As for the Swedish, they signed 2 contracts for cargo ships of 4370-gross tonnage with a total value of 7.704.998 SEK. A passenger ship of 7200-gross tonnage, named Mexico, with a value of 3.175.844 Lira was bought from a private company in the US. Also 6 ships with a value of 10,500,598 Lira were bought with a contract dated 24.12.1946 signed with Maritime Commission in the US.

⁵⁷ BCA, 030.10.00.00.14.81.01.4.

⁵⁸ Seven warehouses and entrepots with a width of 17.000 m² were built at various spots in İstanbul Harbour. Also the necessary orders were given for the purchase of modern and mechanical vehicles for several harbours. For this purpose, mobile cranes, motor vehicles and fork-lift trucks were delivered and began to be used. Additionally, mechanical tools such as floating cranes, winches were ordered.

⁵⁹ For this purpose, the construction of a dry dock facility with a length of 85 meters and a depth of 17 meters that cost 1.200.000 Lira was launched beside the existing docks in Haliç. Also the expertise and support of the leading countries in navigation were benefited in order to develop this construction and the existing shipyards. BCA, 030.10.00.00.14.81.01.4.

⁶⁰ Ship owners requested the provision of government bond in return for establishing a lien on the ships that would be bought by themselves in order to expand the size of the current fleet. Afterwards, the request concerning the provision of a government bond while buying ships from foreign countries was accepted by the Ministry of Finance. BCA, 030.10.00.00.14.81.1.24. Ship owners also requested that the government didn't get a profit tax out of the profits that would be obtained from the new ships for a period determined by the government and that it waived the profit tax that was being taken from insurance premium payments that exceeded the value of sunken ships. The Ministry conveyed its opinion concerning such an exemption regarding this issue or at least about the alleviation of tax load to the Prime Ministry. BCA, 030.10.00.00.14.81.1.25. Ship owners also requested that the law numbered 2239 that separated the work area between the State Maritime Lines and themselves and made a distribution and division among this authority and ship owners in inland waters; they proposed to be given more work opportunities. However, their requests were not found acceptable by the Ministry. BCA, 030.10.00.00.14.81.1.26.

⁶¹ BCA, 030.10.00.00.14.81.1.27.

⁶² In the Decision numbered 3/5179 of the General Directorate of Laws and Decisions, the official writing of the Ministry of Transport dated 20.12.1946 and numbered 70700/54/13368 on the approval of the program with a value of 140.000.000 concerning the works where provisional commitments would be made in the following years for the needs of General Directorate of Railways and Harbors was accepted by the Council of Ministers in a meeting held on 02.01.1947. BCA, 030.10.00.00.14.81.1.10.

⁶³ From the decision of the Prime Ministry General Directorate of Documentation numbered 3/5179, it is understood that the program with a value of 41 million Lira, concerning the works where provisional commitments would be made in the following years for the needs of General Directorate of Railways and Harbors was approved with the decision of the Council of Ministers dated 12.07.1946 while the program with a value of 28.280.000 Lira



large passenger-cargo ships, four medium passenger-cargo ships, two small passenger-cargo ships, six cargo ships, four large city line ships, six medium city line ships (*Şehir hattı gemisi*), two small city line ships, one open sea rescue ship, one dredger and one ship with a heavy duty winch. The remaining 23.250.000 was used for harbour and factory equipment.⁶⁴ The detailed distribution of this 76.000.000 Lira-budget is given on Table 3.

Table 3. The distribution of the budget allocated for navigation in 1946-1950

Years	Works to be Performed	PAYMENT		
		External	Internal	TOTAL
1946	Ship - Factory - Harbour	8.000.000	4.000.000	12.000.000
1947	Ship - Factory - Harbour	8.650.000	3.350.000	12.000.000
1948	Ship - Factory - Harbour	8.750.000	3.250.000	12.000.000
1949	Ship	12.000.000	-	12.000.000
1950	Ship	12.000.000	-	12.000.000
1951	Ship	12.000.000	-	12.000.000
1952	Ship	4.000.000	-	4.000.000
	TOTAL	65.400.000	10.600.000	76.000.000

Source: BCA, 030.10.00.00.14.81.1.12.

The period between 1950-1960 is considered to be the period when statism was abandoned and liberalism was adopted. In this period, the Democrat Party was in rule and the most important step taken during this time concerning navigation was the establishment of the “Turkish Maritime Bank Inc.” on 1 March 1952. As a result of this important step, the duties and responsibilities of the “General Directorate of Railways and Harbours” established in 1944 were transferred to Maritime Bank.⁶⁵

The period of 1945-1950 was the time when the purchase of ships was given utmost importance in navigational policies. Afterwards, another period in which it was aimed to modernize more shipyards and to focus more on shipbuilding was launched with the establishment of Maritime Bank.⁶⁶ The fact that a total of 59 million Lira investment was made in order to renovate shipyards between 1952 and 1955 was an indication of this orientation.⁶⁷

was approved with the decision of the Council of Ministers dated 21.11.1946. Additionally, General Directorate of Railways and Harbors provided a supplementary appropriation of 10.000.000 Lira concerning Article 14 (vessel, vehicle, factory and atelier expenses) of the marked statement (A) under the Law of Appropriation of 1947. BCA, 030.10.00.00.14.81.1.8.

⁶⁴ BCA, 030.10.00.00.14.81.1.12.

⁶⁵ Mehmet Çevik - Murat Yıldız, “An Overview of Maritime Management during the First Years Under the Rule of Democrat Party and Shipbuilding Industry (1950-1955)”, *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 7/3, 2014, p.297.

⁶⁶ BCA, 030.01/108.680.4.

⁶⁷ Çevik- Yıldız, An Overview of Maritime Management..., p. 303.



JHS
118

History
Studies

Volume 8
Issue 2
June
2016

Considerable investments were made in navigation in 1950-1960 and İzmir and Mersin Harbours got their share from these investments. The allocated budget was mostly used for the re-construction, expansion, modernization of the two harbours and for the construction of breakwaters. For this purpose, a total budget of 39.440.127 TL was used for the expansion of the harbour area in İzmir Harbour and for the construction of the breakwater; work started in October 1953 was completed in March 1959⁶⁸. Similarly, a budget of 68.867.797 TL was allocated for the re-construction of Mersin Harbour and work started in February 1954 was completed in August 1959.⁶⁹

When an evaluation is made with regards to the state economy in 1945-1950 considering the import-export values, it is seen that the export value of 432.094.460 TL⁷⁰ in 1946 reached 1.016.15.436 TL⁷¹ by increasing regularly until 1952. Some declines were recorded afterwards however these did not last long and a recovery was achieved with an export value of 2.158.466.541 TL⁷² in 1960. As for the import rates, it is seen on Table 4 that the general import value of Turkey that was 223.931.229 TL⁷³ in 1946 increased regularly until 1952 and reached 1.556.575.265 TL;⁷⁴ however, significant declines were recorded afterwards and the highest figures were hit in 1960 with 216.1854.948.⁷⁵

When the reflection of the situation of İzmir-Mersin Harbours in 1946-1960 was investigated statistically and a comparison was made, it was seen that the export and import values of both İzmir and Mersin Harbours increased with each year; however serious declines were recorded in 1954 - 1959 when construction works continued at the harbours. Of the total general export value of 432.094.460 Lira in 1946 in Turkey, 160.986.000 Lira⁷⁶ was acquired from İzmir Harbour and 33.638.000 Lira⁷⁷ was acquired from Mersin Harbour; as for the year 1960, 693.998.121 Lira⁷⁸ of the total general export value of 2.158.466.541 TL was acquired from İzmir Harbour while 183.673.686 TL⁷⁹ was acquired from Mersin Harbour.

Table 4. Import - Export Values of Turkey and of İzmir-Mersin Harbours (1946-1960)

Years	İzmir Harbour (lira)		Mersin Harbour (lira)		Turkey (lira)	
	Import	Export	Import	Export	Import	Export
1946	12.876.000	160.986.000	3.015.000	33.638.000	223.931.229	432.094.460
1948	44.413.000	228.720.000	5.394.000	45.073.000	770.148.535	551.038.451
1950	62.904.877	308.096.741	9.090.420	120.624.519	799.859.127	737.586.635
1952	174.334.875	350.585.780	43.043.119	122.051.570	1.556.575.265	1.016.158.436
1954	110.200.543	360.539.073	43.806.931	126.894.120	1.339.403.680	937.786.741
1956	120.471.592	325.106.657	13.962.985	60.347.129	1.140.552.686	853.971.668
1958	124.992.465	281.080.907	10.103.412	52.675.877	882.274.903	692.357.960

⁶⁸ BCA, 030.01.00.00.94.586.10.5.

⁶⁹ BCA, 030.01.00.00.94.586.10.6

⁷⁰ TÜİK, Annual Statistic, Commerce Special, 1946, p. 35.

⁷¹ TÜİK, Annual Statistic, Commerce Special, 1952, p. 25.

⁷² TÜİK, Annual Statistic, Commerce Special, 1960, p. 22.

⁷³ TÜİK, Annual Statistic, Commerce Special, 1946, p. 35.

⁷⁴ TÜİK, Annual Statistic, Commerce Special, 1952, p. 25.

⁷⁵ TÜİK, Annual Statistic, Commerce Special, 1960, p. 22.

⁷⁶ TÜİK, Annual Statistic, Commerce Special, 1945-1946, Part 3, p. 9-17.

⁷⁷ TÜİK, Annual Statistic, Commerce Special, 1945-1946, p. 9-17.

⁷⁸ TÜİK, Annual Statistic, Commerce Special, 1960, Part 3, p. 8-16.

⁷⁹ TÜİK, Annual Statistic, Commerce Special, 1960, p. 8-16.



1960 275.537.793 693.998.121 15.860.514 183.673.686 2.161.854.948 2.158.466.541

Source: TÜİK Statistics⁸⁰

When the products that were imported/exported through İzmir Harbour during this time were categorized, it was seen that the products that were imported most were machines, all kinds of steel and iron, cereals, motor road vehicles and electrical machines and devices whereas the products that were exported most were tobacco, cotton, fruits. At Mersin Harbour, the products that were imported most were machines, glasses, fertilizer, cereals, cast iron, steel, boilers and mechanical devices while those that were exported most were cotton, livestock, saplings, flowers, fruits, sugar and sugar-based products.⁸¹

Conclusion

Between 1930 and 1938 when statist industrial policies were carried out, a protective policy was adopted in economics, as in almost any other area. With this understanding, the First 5-Year Industry Plan was prepared with the aim of establishing factories in branches of industry such as textiles, mining, paper, ceramic and chemicals; however, navigation was not included within this scope. This deficiency was felt in the Second 5-Year Industry Plan that was prepared in 1936 and navigation was included in this second plan. Nevertheless, all the investments that were projected to be carried out remained on paper due to the Second World War that broke out in April 1939 and could not be put into practice. The only significant regulation concerning navigation that took place in these years was the establishment of *Denizbank* in 1937 and all the formations with regards to navigation gathered under the roof of *Denizbank*.

The Second World War that broke out just when the country began to recover, leading to new economic disruptions. The import value of Turkey that was 147.553.703 Lira in 1930 declined to 74.815.069 Lira until 1940 while the export value of 151.454.371 declined to 123.080.868. However, this falling trend did not last long and the country reached the same level it had before the wartime, in 1942.

When the situation of Turkish harbours until the wartime is investigated, it can be said that harbour areas and docks were narrow, the number and capacity of the equipment used for loading/discharging at harbours were not enough and also the cases of smuggling-theft, perfunctory practices that went beyond their purpose as well as the harbour charges were high in comparison to other countries. There were similar problems in İzmir Harbour, considered to be the second biggest harbour of Turkey due to being the center of export for tobacco, grapes and figs as well as Mersin Harbour that was the only Turkish harbour operating in the eastern Mediterranean.

The trade volume of İzmir and Mersin Harbours that gradually decreased due to existing inadequacies in 1930-1945 almost hit the bottom during the wartime. This jagged decline can be clearly seen in the following figures: In İzmir Harbour, the export value that reached its peak in 1935 with 84.076.696 Lira declined to 27.762.484 Lira in 1941. As for Mersin Harbour, the export value that was 13.244.000 Lira in 1930 experienced a contraction of more than 70% in 1940 and declined to 3.042.478.

⁸⁰ TÜİK, Annual Statistic, Commerce Special, 1948, Part 1, p. 11-19; TÜİK, Annual Statistic, Commerce Special, 1950, Part 1, p. 59-63; TÜİK, Annual Statistic, Commerce Special, 1952, Part 1, p. 66-70; TÜİK, Annual Statistic, Commerce Special, 1954, Part 3, p. 9-19; TÜİK, Annual Statistic, Commerce Special, 1956, Part 3, p. 112-119; TÜİK, Annual Statistic, Commerce Special, 1958, Part 3, p. 102-109.

⁸¹ TÜİK, Annual Statistic, Commercial Special, 1945-1960, Parts 3.



JHS
120

History
Studies

Volume 8
Issue 2
June
2016

With the end of the Second World War, a period of investment began in every area across the country. In navigation, these investments mostly focused on the purchase of ships. The most important indicator of this orientation was the fact that a budget of 140.000.000 Lira was allocated to the use of the General Directorate of State Railways and Harbours especially in 1946-1952 and 76.000.000 Lira out of this budget was used for the purchase of ships and the construction of factories and harbours. In this process, a total of twenty-three ships were added to the Turkish fleet. Also, the deficiencies at harbours were eliminated and modern mechanical vehicles were bought for harbours. Additionally, a law project was created with a view to opening a branch of Maritime Loan under the roof of Turkish Mortgage Loan Bank upon ship owners' requests of low-interest and long-term loans.

In 1952 when all the activities under the General Directorate of State Railways and Harbours were transferred to the Maritime Bank, it was aimed mostly to renovate shipyards and a total 59 million Lira investment was made. İzmir and Mersin Harbours got their share from these investments. This allocated budget was used mostly for the re-construction, expansion, modernization of these two harbours and for the construction of breakwaters.

When an evaluation was made to determine place of İzmir and Mersin Harbours within the state economy in 1946-1960 considering the export values of these harbours within the general export value of Turkey, the following figures were found: of the total general export value of 432.094.460 Lira in 1946 in Turkey, 160.986.000 Lira was acquired through İzmir Harbour and 33.638.000 Lira was acquired through Mersin Harbour; as for the year 1960, 693.998.121 Lira of the total general export value of 2.158.466.541 TL was acquired through İzmir Harbour while 183.673.686 TL was acquired through Mersin Harbour. The reason for the declines in some years during this period was the construction work carried out at harbours and it can be said that the trade volume always sustained an increasing trend after 1946.

As a result, İzmir and Mersin Harbours were considered to be the leading harbours across the country in each period of the 30-year process between 1930-1960; however, they could get the attention they deserved only after 1945. It was concluded that these harbours increased their own trade volumes through the construction works carried out after 1952 and made important contributions to the state economy.

Bibliography

Archive Documents

Republican Archives of Prime Ministry (BCA)

BCA, 030.01.00.00.39.233.11.3.

BCA, 030.01.00.00.39.233.11.7.

BCA, 030.10.00.00.27.153.2.61.

BCA, 030.10.00.00.27.153.2.56.

BCA, 030.10.00.00.27.153.2.57.

BCA, 030.10.00.00.27.153.2.64.

BCA, 030.10.00.00.27.153.00.2.

BCA, 030.10.00.00.27.153.2.54.

BCA, 030.10.00.00.27.153.2.58.



BCA, 030.10.00.00.27.153.2.59.
BCA, 030.10.00.00.27.153.2.62.
BCA, 030.10.00.00.27.153.2.63.
BCA, 030.10.00.00.14.81.01.3.
BCA, 030.10.00.00.14.81.01.4.
BCA, 030.10.00.00.14.81.1.24.
BCA, 030.10.00.00.14.81.1.25.
BCA, 030.10.00.00.14.81.1.26.
BCA, 030.10.00.00.14.81.1.27.
BCA, 030.10.00.00.14.81.1.10.
BCA, 030.10.00.00.14.81.1.8.
BCA, 030.10.00.00.14.81.1.12.
BCA, 030.01/108.680.4.
BCA, 030.01.00.00.94.586.10.5.
BCA, 030.01.00.00.94.586.10.6

Annual Statistics

Prime Ministry State Institute of Statistics (TÜİK)

TÜİK, Annual Statistic, 1935-1936, p. 451.
TÜİK, Annual Statistic, 1930/31, p. 284.
TÜİK, Annual Statistic, 1940/41, p. 168.
TÜİK, Annual Statistic, 1930/31, p. 384-385.
TÜİK, Annual Statistic, 1941, Part 1, p. 39.
TÜİK, Annual Statistic, 1936/37, V.9, p. 497.
TÜİK, Annual Statistic, 1941, Part 1, p. 41.
TÜİK, Annual Statistic, 1932/33, V. 6, p. 250/460.
TÜİK, Annual Statistic, 1935/36, V. 8, p. 279-451.
TÜİK, Annual Statistic, 1936/37, V.9, p. 219-226.
TÜİK, Annual Statistic, Commerce Exterior, 1937, Part 3, p. 6.
TÜİK, Annual Statistic, Commerce Special, 1939, Part 1, p. 9-42.
TÜİK, Annual Statistic, Commerce Special, 1941, Part 1, p. 7-40.
TÜİK, Annual Statistic, Commerce Special, 1943, Part 1, p. 21-55.
TÜİK, Annual Statistic, Commerce Special, 1946, Part 1, p. 35-80.
TÜİK, Annual Statistic, 1930/31, p. 399-419.



JHS
122

History
Studies

Volume 8
Issue 2
June
2016

- TÜİK, Annual Statistic, 1939, Part 1, p. 9.
TÜİK, Annual Statistic, 1950, p. 410.
TÜİK, Annual Statistic, 1950, V.18, p. 396-400.
TÜİK, Annual Statistic, 1940-1941, p. 599.
TÜİK, Annual Statistic, Commercial Special, 1930-1945, Parts 3.
TÜİK, Annual Statistic, Commerce Special, 1946, p. 35.
TÜİK, Annual Statistic, Commerce Special, 1952, p. 25.
TÜİK, Annual Statistic, Commerce Special, 1960, p. 22.
TÜİK, Annual Statistic, Commerce Special, 1945-1946, Part 3, p. 9-17.
TÜİK, Annual Statistic, Commerce Special, 1960, Part 3, p. 8-16.
TÜİK, Annual Statistic, Commerce Special, 1948, Part 1, p. 11-19.
TÜİK, Annual Statistic, Commerce Special, 1950, Part 1, p. 59-63.
TÜİK, Annual Statistic, Commerce Special, 1952, Part 1, p. 66-70.
TÜİK, Annual Statistic, Commerce Special, 1954, Parti 3, p. 9-19.
TÜİK, Annual Statistic, Commerce Special, 1956, Parti 3, p. 112-119.
TÜİK, Annual Statistic, Commerce Special, 1958, Parti 3, p. 102-109.
TÜİK, Annual Statistic, Commercial Special, 1945-1960, Parts 3.

Official Publications

Official Gazette of Republic of Turkey (RG), No: 640, 24 July 1927.

Secondary Sources

- AKIN, Fehmi - Serkan Bayraktar, "One of the Economic Foundations of Early Republican
Period: Higher Council of Economy, *Dumlupınar University Social Sciences Journal*,
Issue. 29, April 2011, p. 115-117.
- ÇEVİK, Mehmet - Murat Yıldız, "An Overview of Maritime Management during the
First
Years Under the Rule of Democrat Party and Shipbuilding Industry (1950-1955)",
Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi, 7/3, 2014, p. 297.
- ÇOLAK, Filiz, "A General Overview Of The Transportation Policy Of The Turkish
Republic
In The Atatürk Era", *Turkish Studies*, 8/2, Winter 2013, p.357-360.
- DEMİRBILEK, Sinan, "Monopolies In The One-Party System", *Çttad*, 12/24, Spring
2012, p. 205-216.
- İSTİKBAL, [Cahit](#), "Turkish Straits: Difficulties and Role of Pilotage". *SeaNews*, 03



JHS
123

**History
Studies**

Volume 8
Issue 2
June
2016

November 2015. <http://www.denizhaber.com/turk-bogazlari-makale,100974.html>
(Accessed: 05.15.2016).

KARADENİZ, Şengül - Zehra Arslan, "The Situation Of Ports In Turkey During Early 1930s

According To Report Of Higher Council Of Economy Dated As 15-29 December 1931", *Turkish Studies*, 8/12, Fall 2013, p.651-655.

KORALTÜRK, Murat, "Âli İktisat Meclisi (Higher Council of Economy) (1927-1935)", *Economic Approach*, 7/23, 1996, p. 47.

YAKTI, Özlem - Perihan Ünlü Soylu, "A Leading Advisory Board on the Way to Economic

Development: Higher Council of Economy", *Ankara University- Institute of Turkish Revolution History, Journal of Atatürk Yolu*, No, 47, Spring 2011, p.680-681.



JHS
124

History
Studies

Volume 8
Issue 2
June
2016