

# The Political Developments in Turkey during Ataturk's Period

Elnur Hasan Mikail<sup>1</sup>, Andaç Karabulut<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Political Sciences and International Relations, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Kafkas University, Kars, Turkey

<sup>2</sup>Department of Political Sciences and International Relations, Istanbul Esenyurt University, Istanbul, Turkey

Email: emikail@turansam.org

**How to cite this paper:** Mikail, E. H., & Karabulut, A. (2017). The Political Developments in Turkey during Ataturk's Period. *Open Journal of Political Science*, 7, 511-523.

<https://doi.org/10.4236/ojps.2017.74040>

**Received:** September 25, 2017

**Accepted:** October 24, 2017

**Published:** October 27, 2017

Copyright © 2017 by authors and Scientific Research Publishing Inc.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0).

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



Open Access

## Abstract

It has been understood that during the Şeyh Sait Rebellion in East Anatolia, the Prime Minister Fethi Bey had a talk with the Leaders of this Party, that he had warned them and suggested to moderate or totally remove the Party organizations there. As this revolt became a dangerous face, the Government legalized the proposed Law concerning “the Religion must not be an instrument for the Politics” on the 25th of February 1925. However, after the questioning proposal in the C.H.P group with 18 signs concerning the facts in the East, there was held a vote of confidence for the Government and the cabinet resigned as a mistrust result for Fethi Bey with 60 dissensual votes from 94 total votes. Ismet Paşa was charged with the duty to set up a new cabinet. In view of the Şeyh Sait Rebellion, it has been seen that the Progressive-minded Party supported the cabinet of Fethi Bey and moreover, that the Leader Kazim Karabekir Paşa responded the martial Law decision of this Government as constructive and that he condemned this Rebellion by saying that: those who put the national presence in danger by procuring the religion as an instrument are deserving curse. This behaviour is infidelity to the country about the Rebellion.

## Keywords

Political Developments, Turkey, Ataturk, Kazim Karabekir Pasha, Progressive Republican Party, Free Republican Party, The Menemen Incident

## 1. Introduction

However as Karabekir Paşa and also Rauf Bey and the notables from the other Progressive-minded Party were against Ismet Paşa who wants to have the Ta-

krir-i Sükun (Peace official Note) Law accepted, it is seen that they were not for the application of radical precautions to protect the Republic Regime. Despite the fact that the Opposition was against it, the request of the Ismet Paşa Government on this issue the Takrir-i Sükun (Peace official Note) Act went into force voted by the Turkish National Assembly on 4 March 1924 with 23 negative and 2 abstaining votes and 155 votes in total. Together with this Act also the Courts of Independence took up their duty again. Once the Şeyh Sait Rebellion was suppressed, during the judgment of the insurgents, leaders”, the Eastern Court Of Independence decided to close the Party due to the fact that the Progressive minded Republic Party was connected with religious propaganda and provocations.

After the Progressive Republican Party (Terakkiperver Cumhuriyet Firkasi) completed its establishment, it started criticizing the government. It increased its criticism even more during the by-election, carried out for the thirteen deputies, claiming that it had been exposed to pressure. Meanwhile the party’s attitude to “regard it as useful to instrumentalize religious elements against its rivals” caught Mustafa Kemal’s attention, who had been struggling to realize secular reforms successfully. Thus, the party was labeled as anti-republican and reactionary by Mustafa Kemal Pasha.

### **1.1. Progressive-Minded Republic Party**

It has been deduced that during the Sheikh Said Rebellion in the Eastern Anatolia Region the Prime Minister in Mr. Fethi Okyar had warned the party leader and proposed that the party organizations should be either restrained or completely abolished in this region. When the rebellion took a dangerous turn, on 25th February 1925 the government legalized the proposal that “religion should not be instrumentalized for political ends”. After the Republican People’s Party (CHP) group applied for an inquiry with 18 signatures, a vote of confidence was executed against the Prime Minister Mr. Fethi Okyar, which resulted in 60 to 94 votes of nonconfidence and thus the cabinet resigned. Ismet Pasha was charged with the duty of forming the new government. It was seen that the Progressive Republican Party supported the cabinet of Mr. Fethi Okyar concerning the Sheikh Said Rebellion. The leader of the PRP Mr. Kazim Karabekir even denounced the rebellion by stating that “Those who abuse religion in order to endanger the national existence are worthy of damnation. This is a betrayal of the fatherland.” (Ağaoğlu, 1981: 25).

Still it was noted that Karabekir Pasha, Mr. Rauf Orbay and other notable PRP members objected to Ismet Pasha who demanded the Law for the Preservation of Order (Takrir-I Sükun Kanunu) to be passed and argued against radical measures to be taken to preserve the republican regime. Despite the objections by the opposition, in accordance with the demand of Ismet Pasha Government the Law for the Preservation of Order was passed with 23 no-votes and two abstaining votes to 155 votes on the 4th March 1924. With this Law the Independence Courts restarted operating. After the Sheikh Said Rebellion was put down,

during the judging process of the ringleaders of the rebellion, “the East Independence Court delivered the judgment that the PRP would be closed down due to its connections to religious propaganda and provocation.” The claim of the Court that the party had connections with the rebellion and the harsh attitude of the government towards the party have been influential factors for the delivery of this judgment. The PRP was closed down with the cabinet decision on 5th June 1925 (Aydemir, 1966: 100-101).

The Izmir assassination was the last act of the struggle between the constitutional monarchists and the republicans after the closure of the Progressive Republican Party. During this rebellion the government made use of the Law of Takrir-i Sükun and established a strict supervision over the press and left the opposition effectless besides the leaders of the assassination. The Progressive Republican Party, which had a political existence of approximately seven months, was the first attempt for an opposition party and there was no such an attempt until 1930. One of the most important conclusions to draw from this experience has been that it was understood that the multi-party regime and the revolutions would not go along with each other. Therefore, the republican regime had to wait for another attempt of establishing a multi-party regime, till it completed its revolutions (Hüsameddin, 1964: 198-200).

## 1.2. Sheikh Said Rebellion

Sheikh Said started the first rebellion on 13th February 1925 in Piran, the village of Egil town, which is the district of Ergani. According to Ataturk and his friends, this rebellion was a pre-planned movement. There was a doubt that England, Vahdettin who was in abroad and Seyit Abdulkadir, the President of İstanbul Kurd Association, took place in that movement. The rebellion progressed quickly, after all, although Prime Minister Fethi Okyar was not nervous, he did not pay attention to the claim that Terakkiperver Party encouraged the actions (events); but the Republic (Community) Party started to broke up and the arguments were exorbitant. Hereupon, Fethi Okyar had to withdraw (retreated) from Presidency. The second cabinet of Republic of Turkey survived just for three months. Ismet Pasha became the leader of the cabinet once again (Kirçak, 2001: 63).

At first, he captured Darhani which is the centre of Genc city, and after he forced to withdraw a regiment and ambushed a cavalcade, he captured Elazig. Then, even though rebellious groups went forward to Diyarbakir and wanted to capture the city, they got nothing. Ali Fethi Okyar cabinet thought that the rebellion was regional could be controlled (counterinsurgency) promptly. But, as the rebellion spread out quickly; and included Diyarbakir, Elaziğ and Genc cities and started to enlarge, the cabinet proclaimed martial law in the region. The action is a rebellion that threatened to newly-established Republic of Turkey and its reforms. In the caliphate congress in Bucharest, Vahdettin partisans decided to attempt a counter-revolution by conspiring in Turkey and making rebellion.

Counter-rebellion committee contributed to confidential declarations, reform breakthroughs were disparaged by mobile hodjas and street traders and made suggestions in favor of caliphate. Caliphate Committee made preparation for a revolution by compromising with Sheikh Said (Bilgin, 1989: 41).

### **1.3. The Establishment of Peace Act (Tahrir-i Sükun)**

The Establishment of Peace Act came into force on 4th of March 1925 with the aim of preventing the dangers and the unprecedented conditions created by the Progressive Republican Division (Terakkiperver Cumhuriyet Firkası) and the Şeyh Sait rebellion. The act which was to be valid for two years was extended for another two before being rescinded on 4th of March 1929.

At no time and under no circumstances did we use the unprecedented but the legal measures to suppress the law or as a tool, on the contrary we used it to establish order and security in the country and to provide for the continuity of the state and to protect its independence. We used those measures for the nation's civil and social development. For that reason, we will use all tools necessary with only one aim in pursuance those aims. That aim is to raise the Turkish nation to its rightful place in the world and to strengthen the Turkish republic with each passing day on its unshakable foundations, and to eradicate the idea of repression in pursuance of these purposes.

The first task of the new government was to submit the Establishment of the Peace Act to the parliament. The act that consisted of two articles was set out as follows:

1) Article: The government, with the approval of the President, is authorized to ban on its own, all publications, initiatives and organizations, that provoke and encourage fundamentalism and rebellion and have the aim of disrupting the social order, peace and tranquility and security and public order. It may bring those participating in such actions to the Courts of Independence (Danışmend, 1955: 23).

2) Article: The Council of Ministers is responsible for the enactment of this law (Kirçak, 2001: 26-27). The act resulted in objections at the parliament. The rebellion was achieving proportions that were far from a simple social movement. When the support units were arrived in Diyarbakir, the rebels withdrew. The army started its assault to Diyarbakir, Elaziğ and Varto. All the settlements were gradually cleared of the rebels and in the end Seyh Sait and all his men were captured. They were tried in the Diyarbakir Courts of Independence and hanged. After this event the Establishment of Peace Act was advancing and sweeping all before it like a tornado. All newspapers that could be considered as opposition were shut down. Some of the authors and intellectuals were already being jailed (Cevat Şakir-The Fisherman of Halicarnassus, Nazim Hikmet). Subsequent to these events the Progressive Republican Division was shut down by a decision of the parliament on 3rd June 1925. In spite of these developments, it's undeniable that the Establishment of Peace Act arose from the requirement

of the critical conditions of the day. When examined objectively different conclusions maybe reached. Atatürk has made the following statement on the act: "If you evaluate the work done by the Courts of Independence during the period when the Establishment of Peace Act was in force, it will become self evident that the trust and faith of the Parliament and the nation was used in just and proper manner." (Danışmend, 1955: 23)

Of course the attempts at destruction of progressive thinking and the imprisonment of intellectuals is a historical mistake. A view of the events from a wider perspective will reveal many of the positive and negative aspects. The passing of similar repressive acts in our day is a clear indication that lessons from those days have not been learned.

With the disruption of Ottoman Empire after the First World War, the Kurds started to chase their independence. The Kurdish Tali Association founded for this purpose was aiming to establish an independent Kurdish state under the British mandate. Despite its dissolution after the proclamation of the Turkish Republic, this association continued its activities under the name of Comity of Kurdish Independence. As the revolt started, Seyit Abdulkadir tried to lead the Kurds in Istanbul to an armed reactionary movement and he made some plans for this aim. Sheikh Said rebellion has also a relation with England. It was necessary that the Mosul problem, which had not been resolved by the Treaty of Lausanne, had to be brought to the League of Nations, as the British Conference in Istanbul could not resolve it. England was trying to prevent the Mosul people's request to unite with Turkey, and on the other hand it was encouraging revolts and anarchy in order to damage Turkish political stability. The Progressive Republican Party, founded in this period, was composed of the opponents who were favorable to Padishah and to Sharia. In consequence of necessity to take serious measures, Ali Fethi Okyar quitted his task of Prime Ministry. The new government was founded by Ismet Inonu. The first action of the new government who received the vote of confidence was to make two laws in the Parliament, one of which delegated authority to the government to take the necessary measures against the rebellion, Takrir-i Sükun Law (Law on the Establishment of the ease). The other law was permitting the establishment of two Independence Courts, one in the rebellious region and another in Ankara (Okyar, 1980: 103).

Takrir-i Sükun Law came into force on 4 March 1925 in order to prevent the obstacles posed by the dangers such as the Progressive Republican Party and Sheikh Said rebellion. This law, which was once prepared for two years, was extended for two more years and abolished on 4 March 1929. With a planned military operation the rebels were defeated and their leaders were arrested immediately. During the judgments before the Independence Court it was determined that the criminals had taken action and organized a confidential organization in order to divide up the country and to establish a Kurdish state under the veil of release the religion and the Sharia. Consequently, all the leaders, including

Sheikh Said and Seyit Abdülkadir were condemned to death and this judgment was instantly enforced. It was precisely understood from the admission of criminals before the Independence Court that the clauses in the Progressive Republican Party's program, which announced that religious beliefs and opinions would be respected and the procedure of decentralization would be applied. And the propagandas made by party members on this way had both served to those who organized the rebellion and also encouraged the crowd to rebellion. For his reason the Independence Court in the East, in Diyarbakir, decided to close all the branches of the Progressive Republican Party in his territory of jurisdiction. The Court in Ankara caught the government's attention to the party's situation and the form of operation as in the propagandas of this party the religion and the religious values were used for political purposes.

The government of the Republic, taking in consideration the judgments of the Independence Courts of Diyarbakir and Ankara, decided to enclose all branches and head quarters of the Progressive Republican Party on the 3 July 1925.

#### **1.4. Free Republican Party**

Thus, Free Republican Party established by the wish of Atatürk in order to reach multi-party system in 12 August of 1930. Free Republican Party has gone in politics as an opposition party that advocates liberalism. Party would stick to foundations of republicanism, nationalism and laicism according to its program. Besides, party also advocated that elections must be single graded and women must have civil (political) rights. Generally, party was advocating liberalism against to the statist concept of Free Republican Party (Yetkin, 1930: 85).

Free Republican Party has been developed rapidly. Aegean travel of Mr. Fethi conduced to propaganda of public opposite of laicism, revolution and government. In spite of all preventions, obscurantism appeared again with its dangerous identity. Participation of people to the party couldn't be prevented. People who participated in the party attempted an obscurant and deep conservative propaganda. They did not hesitate to say that fez will be wear again, dervish lodges will be opened, and Arabic letters will be used again and also did not hesitate to talk against Mustafa Kemal Pasha. Circumstances that get out of control of Mr. Fethi engaged him with Mustafa Kemal Pasha in a dispute. At the time of Free Republican Party that existed for a very short time, general elections and local elections did not make and although municipal elections made, Free Republican Party won all them. With the assertion that a constraint is made in council about municipal elections, government criticized. These arguments turned into a hard struggle. Finally, Free Republican Party abolished itself in 18 December of 1930. In the document that Party abolished itself, concern about coming across to Ghazi Excellency (Atatürk) with regard to political ideas pointed out the most important cause of abolishment.

The establishment of Free Republican Party fundamentally intended for effacement of deficiencies of single party governance; however it does not bear an

aim like arranging the regime. Main goal is to find out the deficiencies of Republican Peoples Party and to adjust these deficiencies. Undoubtedly, there are other reasons of establishment of New Party. Roughly these can be separate to 2 groups as interior and exterior reasons. If we examine exterior reasons: Mr. Fethi, the founder of Party, is Paris Ambassador. The reason of choosing Mr. Fethi for this duty is to meet with approval of national opinion (Western countries implied with national opinion). There is a Duyun-i Umumiye (General Debts) that must be purified by country and a big 1929 year' slump broken out. The most critical one of the interior reasons is economical one. Public couldn't reached the economical welfare level that has been committed in establishment time of government and slump that affected all the world also affected Turkish nation. It is certain that there is effect of Kurdish rebellions that experienced eastwards behind this stump.

Republican Peoples Party, made the name, program and even financing of Free Party. The aim of all these is shortly to organize the new party as CHP wishes and thus to control the contrary tendencies that exists country wide or lies snug.

After the establishment of Party, they started to be organized quickly. Mr. Fethi went on a journey to İzmir with the Party managements; but this journey caused big surprises for whether Atatürk who supports the Party, or for Republican Peoples Party or also for Fethi Okyar. Although Mr. Fethi hopes that he will meet with a big reaction, thousands of people came there to meet him and they cheered him in an excited manner. This gush is overdo so that Mr. Fethi' jacket is ripped, windows of his car is broken and ceiling of the car is collapsed. Events did not finish with this; with the reason of local government units' keeping distance with Mr. Fethi and his team and dislike them, some problems existed. Mr. Fethi took a writing from Prefect that wants from him to cancel his cancel.

Upon this, he wanted to telegraph to Mustafa Kemal Atatürk in order to tell to situation. Post office did not accept the telegraph; but after a big effort he could telegraph. Upon this Atatürk declared his support with the telegraph he sent. The day after, people started to become together for the speech. While protesting in front of the Republican Peoples Party building, giving verbal reactions to community from the building made people anger and caused to the stoned of building. After this, crowded started to move the Anatolian Journal. With the conclusion of opening fire by the policemen who defends the building, a child dies and still keeps being together and lays out the child' corpse underfoot of Mr. Fethi. By indicating that this child is a victim; they pointed out that only he can rescue them and also they can give more victims. This city that was saved from enemy occupation from 8 years ago, for what or for whom they frightened so that now they accept Mr. Fethi Okyar as a savior. This was much more than Mr. Fethi hopes. Against the opposition slogans for İsmet İnönü, Fethi Okyar defended him and tried to indicate the labors that he made for homeland. There is

a big effect of city and town middle classes that are affected by stumps and get along with exports in demand of Free Party.

After İzmir and Aegean journeys, Mr. Fethi and Party managements returned to Ankara. Progressive events are also shocked Atatürk too. In a speech he made with Mr. Fethi, it is one of the negative progresses in point of Free Party to point out that support is mainly needed for Republican Peoples Party. Otherwise, support to Free Party comes from some power centers that are against some revolutions and reforms also put Fethi Okyar and his friends into a hard situation. Subsequent to these, Party and Atatürk were becoming distant to each other. Besides, government and state members were in an opposite attitude against Free Party. Upon to oncoming general elections, all people keep an eye on Atatürk. Although Atatürk declared that he would be in equal distance to both parties, then he withdraws his support from Free Party. After this action which is the beginning of the end, Mr. Fethi who already thinks to take a stand against Atatürk bring his friends together quickly. After viewing the subject in all respects, Party took the decision of abolishing itself. 17 November of 1930, Free Republican Party has been closed. An attempt that can be known as imitation is finished in a short time. It couldn't went anymore over a bad experimentation and disappointment (Demirel, 1995: 17-23).

In the period of Takrir-i Sükun Law (Law of Calm Proposal), important steps are taken intended for becoming contemporary of Turkey, law system is changed, clothing and writing reform is done and some developments are supplied in law constitution in respect to laicism. Especially, increasing the negative effects of world stump that starts in 1929 and having bad reaping caused the whimper of people.

Besides this, going not moreover than a political slogan of Populism Principle that prescriptive equality in political and legal point, to use the political affects in order to defend their own rights of some partisans in CHP which supports this principle were worrying Atatürk who is the President and Chief of the Party. While trying to find ways for this grieves, Prime Minister İsmet Pasha suggested to President that "We could not be saved from this illness of making wrong politics and undue influence, if we do not complain about the events that are called as badness and influence abuse. Actually, Ghazi Mustafa Kemal Atatürk was not enjoying of giving a dictator ambiance. He was often observing that how people was living in negative circumstances in homeland journeys. This situation was leading him to complain from government continuously. As a brief, followings are the main reasons of President Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's wish to make contrariety (Tanilli, 1993: 63-78).

1) Public' complains and continuance of bareness which existed in country before now. This situation could endanger the future of political regime. Existing government couldn't be successful in solving the economical problems.

2) The most important revolutions in the way of becoming contemporary are performed between the years 1923-30 and its social affects couldn't be tested be-



cause it has been established under the protection of Takrir-i Sükun Law. It could be measured when contrariety is allowed.

3) Complains about the actions and attitudes of people who asserted to be so close to Atatürk and a member of the Party, was raised. In other words, there was a political “abuse of influence”. Notables, squires and some agriculture bourgeoisie in towns and some commercial bourgeoisie in cities who thinks that it is essential to be in good relations with the government are cooperated with the bureaucrats who are sovereign factor in CHP.

4) President Mustafa Kemal Pasha thought that modernization is possible with the establishment of democratic system; disliked to shown himself as a dictator and said that “I don’t want to legate a despotic establishment to nation behind me and be remembered in history like this.”

5. After Law of Takdir-i Sükun is abolished in 4 March of 1929, a reaction towards not Atatürk but İsmet Pasha and his cabinets which is “loyal to regime and confident contrariety” was started. This contrariety can route the government with its critics by organizing under a political frame.

6) In the period of Takrir-I Sükun Law, most of the people who were against the regime “assimilated” and some of them were restrained. This situation allowed establishing a contrariety which wouldn’t affect the regime.

7) Ghazi founded Mr. Fethi as an opponent to himself who was an old friend of him and also an old Ambassador who had newly returned to homeland, and a reliable person. Mr. Fethi complained in a letter that was written to Atatürk about “Failure of government about monetary and economical situations, not having the independence of idea and irresponsibility of government.” It cannot be estimated from a contrariety party that was established by Mr. Fethi would be against Turkish revolution. Thus, the regime is protected.

### 1.5. The Menemen Incident

When the soldiers drew their guns that were loaded with wooden bullets for the training, one of the reactionaries fired his gun and wounded Kubilay. Dervish Mehmet cut the head of Kubilay with his not sharp knife and put it at the top of the green flag. Watcher Hasan and Şevki who helped Kubilay in this incident were also killed in action. A reactionary named Dervish Mehmet and his six men-at-arms arrived at Menemen at 23 December 1930 and called those, who were in the mosque and who curiously gathered around the mosque, for action by entering into the mosque with a flag that had religious symbols on it. As Dervish Mehmet spoke to the community, he cried:

*“You Muslims why wait? Caliphate Abdülmecit arrived at the border, the flag of Sharif is out there, let’s gather under it and call for Sharia.”* (Özbaran, 1983: 77-79).

They erected the flag with religious symbols in front of the government hall with demonstrations and felicitations. The battalion of reserve second lieutenant Kubilay, whose first occupation was teaching, was assigned to the mission of

diffusing the crowd and arresting the reactionaries. Mr. Kubilay asked the reactionaries to give up and leave as he explained them the ills and dangers of what they were doing. The reactionaries responded to his speech with a rifle bullet. Mr Kubilay fell down with that one bullet although he drew his gun and one the reactionaries jumped on the wounded man and separated his head from his body. In the meantime they also martyr a self-sacrificing district watcher called Hasan. The military units and gendarme arriving at the spot asked the reactionaries to resign. As the reactionaries rejected the call, they fired back to the soldiers. Dervish Mehmet and two of his friends were shot and two others were arrested as a result of the combat. The remaining two were arrested too after two days. After the investigation, it was clear that the incident was not of a regional nature but a reactionary political action to destroy the Republic organized by a national political network. As a response, the government declared martial law in effect for a month in the town of Menemen and also in the cities of Manisa and Balıkesir. The arrested reactionaries were sentenced to heavy penalty after the judiciary trial.

Right after this incident, Atatürk as the President and Commander-in-chief, sent a telegram of condolence to Chief of General Staff, Marshal Fezvi (Çakmak), at 28 December 1930. He dammed the reactionaries' act of sabotage against the Republic and commemorated Mr Kubilay with honor as a martyr killed in action. Atatürk said:

*“All of us aim at with attention to fulfill the responsibilities of our duty with sensibility and fairness. Mr Kubilay who was a young officer of the great army and a precious member of the teaching community of the Republic, strengthen the liveliness of the Republic with his pure blood.” (Makal, 1999: 10-11).*

The responsables of this incident stood trial and those found guilty were sentenced to death after the repression of this case which was perceived as a blasphemy to the Republic and the Turkish Reform Movement. After this incident known as Menemen Incident, there was seen a decrease in the anti-reform propaganda and assault. This case once again showed the dangers of the transition to the multi-party system before all the phases of Turkish reform were completed. In spite of that Atatürk, in the 1935 elections, helped a few opponent deputies to enter the Turkish Grand National Assembly (TGNA) by supporting independent deputy candidates instead of Republican People's Party's candidates in some of the election areas. Therefore he laid the foundation for an independent group at the assembly in his own time.

## **2. Hatay Issue**

France, having an agreement with Syria decided to end the mandating. And even more; with the treaty signed in 8 September 1936, it was predicted that mandating was over in Syria but nothing was told about the sanjak's situation. That event aroused anxiety in Turkey about the sanjak's fate. Turkish government emphasizing on the importance of the issue, the sanjak declared its aspects in the

League of Nations Assembly in 6 October 1936 and in November 1936 to France by giving a note. Atatürk declared the importance given to this issue in the speech when opening the Turkish National Assembly in 1 November 1936. Meanwhile the greatest issue that kept our nation's mind day and night was the real Turkish territories Alexandretta and Hatay's fate. We have to take it seriously and sufficiently. The only great problem between us and France which we give importance to our friendships is this issue. Ones who knows the reality about this issue who loves justice will understand our strong interest and sees it natural (Bilgin, 1989: 11-15).

By declaring that the sanjak wouldn't be separated from Syria, meant a sharp rejection to the Turkish aspects. Issue's negotiations in the League of Nations and recommended by them three witness' going to the territory of sanjak have increased the importance of the issue in the international platform. Via Anthony Eden English ministry of foreign affairs, a treaty was signed in January, 1. Germany's annexation of Austria in March, 1938 meant that French needed a strong Turkey against Germany in the east. The Bosphorus' gained more importance because of the rising crisis and disagreements. In June, 1938 the negotiations between the Turkish and French military committee in Antioch resulted in an agreement in 3 July 1938. To save Hatay's borderlines and the political status, both countries accepted to send a military force made of 2500 soldiers. Turkish army in 4 July 1938, stepped into Hatay and started.

The treaty signed between France and Turkey was making this countries closer at the end of the elections. The Assembly made its first assemble and declared Republic of Hatay independent. As the president Tayfur Sökmen, as the prime minister Abdurrahman Melek was appointed. With a new treaty signed between Turkey and France in 23 June 1939, convenient to public of Hatay's wish, France accepted Hatay's joining in Turkey (Bilgin, 1989: 11-15).

### 3. Conclusion

The Ghazi accused the Progressive Republican Party, which propagated as "We want the caliphate back! We do not want the new laws. We are fine with Mecelle. Madrasah, tekke, ignorant softas, sheiks, followers: We are going to protect you; unite with us! Because Mustafa Kemal's party abolished caliphate. He is damaging Islamism. He will make non-Muslims out of you, and make you wear hats!" In its party programs, of making promises which contradicted the regime and using religion as a flag and of being a product of traitorous minds, a shelter and support for the fanatics.

The conflict between the Progressive Republican Party and the Republican People's Party can be viewed as the struggle between the constitutional monarchy and republic. As İnönü puts it: "The high officials of Progressive Republican People were reformist people as well, but they were Ottoman reformists." Atatürk, on the other hand, aimed at the complete modernization and wanted to reach the goal through revolutionary methods. For this reason, he evaluated the

Eastern Rebellion as an ideological struggle and after putting down the rebellion which is claimed to have ethnic and religious motivations, the members of the PRP in the East were arrested and the party was left motionless.

The account given by Atatürk in his Great Speech, on the passing of the Establishment of Peace Act is as follows: “There were those that assumed and tried to spread the idea that we would use the Establishment of the Peace Act and the Courts of Independence as tools of repression.”

Atatürk wanted to track public’ general tendencies closely and to survey the pulse of people. To this end, he wanted to emplace the multi-party system. He employed Mr. Ali Fethi (Okyar) who is an old and devoted friend of him and also Paris Ambassador at that time to establish a new party. Mustafa Kemal Pasha said to Mr. Ali Fethi that “Establish a party, take the head and defend your thoughts against council. In this wise, you can supply the benefits that are waited from partisanship.

Some of the political circles, which unsuccessfully tried to realize their backward ideas through the use of opposition parties, also revealed their anti-regime hatred with other affairs. One of those was the Menemen Incident. Six members of the Nakşibendi sect—four members under age 18, named Mehmet and two members, named Hasan—arrived to Menemen at 23 December 1930 and descended a mosque. They threatened the community by being put to the sword in case they didn’t gather under the green flag removed from the mosque. The protagonist of this incident, Dervish Mehmet with his green turban, terrorized the town by declaring that he was “Mehdi” (person who shows the right path) and a Caliphate’s army of seven thousand awaited at the border. To repress this threat, teacher and second lieutenant Kubilay was appointed during his preparation for the morning training of his team.

In 1923, when Atatürk arrived in Adana, as a reply to two sobbing girls symbolizing Antiocheia and Alexandretta crying of “save us, too”, he said, “A forty century old Turkish country cannot be foreigners”. The Ankara treaty signed in 1921, was separating the sanjak of Alexandretta from Syria and giving it a different status. The 7 matter of this treaty, predicted that for the Alexandretta territory a new administration system would be established and, the Turkish people in there would get use of any kinds of help for their cultures to be developed and the Turkish money would be the official currency there. Convenient to the treaty, in 8 August 1922 a territorial administration was established in the sanjak.

## References

- Ağaoğlu, S. (1981). *Kuvayi Milliye Ruhu*. [Kuvayi National Spirit.] Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Publications.
- Aydemir, Ş.S. (1966). *İkinci Adam*. [Second Man.] İstanbul: Remzi Publications.
- Bilgin, V. (1989). *Türkiye’de Antidemokratik Düşünce Geleneği Üzerine*. [On the Antidemocratic Thought in Turkey.] Turkey Diary.
- Danişmend, İ.H. (1955). *İzahlı Osmanlı Tarihi Kronolojisi*. [Explained Ottoman History Chronology.] İstanbul.

- Demirel, A. (1995). *Birinci Mecliste Muhalefet. İkinci Grup*. [First Parliamentary Opposition. Second Group.] İstanbul: İletişim Publications.
- Hüsameddin, E. (1964). *İki Devrin Perde Arkası*. [Two Cycle behind the Curtain.] İstanbul: Sebil Publications.
- Kırçak, Ç. (2001). *Cumhuriyet'ten Günümüze Gericilik III*. [Turbulence from the Republic III.] İstanbul: Cumhuriyet Publications.
- Makal, A. (1999). Türkiye'de Tek Partili Dönemde Çalışma İlişkileri: 1920-1946. [Working in Single Party Period in Turkey Relations: 1920-1946.] Ankara: İmge Publications.
- Okyar, F. (1980). Üç Devirde Bir Adam. [A Man in Three Times.] İstanbul: Tercüman History Publications.
- Özbaran, S. (1983). Tarihçi ve Toplum. [Historian and Society.] İzmir: E. U. History Review Journal, I.
- Tanilli, S. (1993). *Fransız Devriminden Portreler*. [Portraits from the French Revolution.] İstanbul: Cem Publications.
- Yetkin, Ç. (1930). *Türkiye'de Tek Parti Yönetimi*. [Single Party Management in Turkey.]. İstanbul: Nadir Publications.