

GENERAL POLITICAL OPINIONS OF AN OPPONENT JOURNALIST
DURING THE EARLY REPUBLICAN PERIOD: FAIK AHMET BARUTÇU AND
ISTIKBAL NEWSPAPER (1923-1925)

by
MEHMET CAN OMAV

Submitted to the Graduate School of Arts and Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Science

Sabancı University
Fall 2009

GENERAL POLITICAL OPINIONS OF AN OPPONENT JOURNALIST
DURING THE EARLY REPUBLICAN PERIOD: FAİK AHMET BARUTÇU AND
ISTIKBAL NEWSPAPER (1923-1925)

APPROVED BY:

Prof. Dr. Cemil Koçak
(Dissertation Supervisor)

Prof. Dr. Fikret Adanır

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ahmet Demirel

DATE OF APPROVAL: 06/02/2009

© MEHMET CAN OMAV 2008

All Rights Reserved

Abstract

Faik Ahmet Barutçu is one of the most significant figures in the Turkish National Struggle Movement. He actively joined the formation of the Society for the Defence of the Rights of Trabzon and he formed Istikbal Newspaper in order to make propaganda for the national struggle in Trabzon and nationwide. After the formation of Istikbal Newspaper he supported the unity of the movement's cadres, declared his views through his articles and took a neutral stand between the First and the Second Group and tried to avoid the formation of divisions inside the movement.

But, with the rise of the conflicts inside the Assembly, the Trabzon deputy and Istikbal Journalist Ali Şükrü Bey was killed. Following the murder Faik Ahmet Bey started to follow the political opinions of the Second Group, and as a republican and liberal he wrote opponent articles against the new regime. According to him under the name of republicanism the new regime brought a new suppression and didn't sufficiently respect the principles of the sovereignty of the people and democracy. At this point Faik Ahmet Bey wrote critical articles and he made proposals for a better republican regime.

Faik Ahmet Bey also joined the formation of the Progressive Republican Party because he believed that the new Party adhered better to those ideals. But with the effect of the Law of the Maintenance of Order his newspaper closed down. The aim of this study is to research the opponent articles of Faik Ahmet Bey, which were written in the Ottoman Alphabet between the years of 1923-1923. And the main goal of the study is to understand the main aspects of Faik Ahmet Barutçu's criticisms and his political opinions.

Özet

Faik Ahmet Barutçu Milli Mücadele tarihinin en önemli figürlerinden biridir. Faik Ahmet Bey Babası Hacı Ahmet Barutçu ile Trabzon Müdafaa-i Hukuk Cemiyeti'nin kuruluşuna aktif olarak katılmış ve kurduğu İstikbal Gazetesi ile Trabzon'de ve tüm yurttaki milli mücadele hareketinin kurulması için çalışmıştır. Hareketin kurulmasından sonra İstikbal Gazetesi'nde yazdığı makaleler ile milli mücadele kadroları arasında birliği savunmuş ve Birinci ve İkinci Gruplar arasında eşit mesafede durmuş, mücadelenin bölünmemesi için çaba göstermiştir.

Ancak meclis içinde artan muhalefet sonucunda aynı zamanda İstikbal Gazetesinin de yazarı olan Trabzon Milletvekili Ali Şükrü Bey öldürülmüştür. Bu olayın etkisi ile Faik Ahmet Bey İkinci Grubun savunduğu ilkeleri kendi görüşlerine daha yakın bulmaya başlamış ve gazetesi aracılığıyla bir cumhuriyetçi ve liberal olarak yeni kurulan rejimi eleştirmeye başlamıştır. Ona göre yeni rejim cumhuriyet adı altında çeşitli siyasal baskıları da beraberinde getirmiş hakimiyet-i milliye prensibine ve demokrasiye yeterince saygılı davranmamıştır. Bu noktada Faik Ahmet Barutçu cumhuriyet rejiminin daha sağlıklı işleyebilmesi için önerilerde bulunmuş, yanlış gördüğü noktaları makaleleri ile eleştirmiştir.

Bu doğrultuda bu prensipleri daha iyi savunduğuna inandığı için Terakkiperver Fırka'nın kuruluşuna da katılmıştır. Ancak 1925 Tahrir-i Sükun Yasası sonucunda gazetesi kapatılmıştır. Bu çalışma Faik Ahmet Bey'in 1923-1925 yılları arasında İstikbal Gazetesi'nde Osmanlıca yazdığı muhalif makalelerin bir incelemesidir. Faik Ahmet Barutçu'nun temel eleştirilerini ve siyasi görüşlerini anlamak çalışmanın temel sorunsalıdır.

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZET	v
TABLE OF CONTENT	vi
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 1. The General Evaluation of the Current Studies on Trabzon, Faik Ahmet Barutçu and Istikbal Newspaper	4
1.1. Studies on Faik Ahmet Barutçu, Istikbal Newspaper and Trabzon's National Struggle	4
1.2. The Main Points of the Studies About Trabzon's Opposition	10
1.3. The Common Arguements in Turkish Historical Writing About Trabzon	18
1.4. The Common Legacy of the Studies	32
CHAPTER 2. Faik Ahmet Barutçu in the Years of 1918-1923	34
2.1. Opposition Figures and Facts	34
2.2. Biography of Faik Ahmet Barutçu	35
2.2.1. Formation of the Society for the Defense of the National Rights of Trabzon	37
2.2.2. Society for the Defense of the National Rights of Trabzon Between 1920-1923	41

2.2.3. Faik Ahmet Barutçu and the Formation of Istikbal Newspaper	45
2.2.4. Istikbal Newspaper and Faik Ahmet Barutçu's Main Views, 1920-1923	47
CHAPTER 3 The Political Incidents of 1923 and Faik Ahmet Bey's General Response	51
3.1. Main Aspects of Faik Ahmet Bey's Political Opinions between 1923-1925: Freedom of Conscious, Public Opinion and Sovereignty of the People	49
3.2. Faik Ahmet Bey's Alienation from the Emerging Regime	56
3.2.1. The 1923 Elections and Faik Ahmet Bey's Attitude	61
3.2.2. Formation of the Republican People's Party	65
3.2.3. The Second Assembly and the New Cabinet	67
3.2.4. Amendment of the Teşkiat-ı Esasiye Law	70
3.2.5. Ankara as the New Centre of the Government	74
3.3. Transition to the Republican Regime and Post-Republican Politics	75
3.3.1. Crises of the Government and Mustafa Kemal Pasha's Offer to Declare The Republican	75
3.3.2. Declaration of the Republic and Faik Ahmet Bey	75
3.3.3. Faik Ahmet Bey's Republican Regime Debates	78
3.3.4. The Post-Republican Regime and Faik Ahmet Bey	85
3.3.5. The First Republican Government and the New Cabinet	88
3.3.6. The New Opposition after the Declaration of the Republic	89
3.3.7. The New Structural Changes After the Declaration of the Republic	93

3.3.8. The Law fo High Treason and the Istanbul Independence Court	97
CHAPTER 4. The Path to the Open Opposition, Events of 1924 And The Formation of the Progressive Republican Party	102
4.1. 1923-1924 Political Events and Faik Ahmet Bey	102
4.2. The Revolutionary Changes and Faik Ahmet Bey	103
4.2.1. Preperation of the 1924 Constitution	110
4.2.2. 1924 Constitutional Debates in the Assembly	114
4.2.3. Political Changes Ater the 1924 Constitution and Faik Ahmet Bey’s Views	122
4.3. The New Political Regime After 1924 Constitution	128
4.3.1. Agressions over Rauf and Refet Pasha	128
4.3.2. The Council of the People’s Party	130
4.3.3. The Problem of the Exiled Rich Armenians	131
4.3.4. The Critique of Ismet Pasha’s Foreign Policy	133
4.3.5. The General Evaluation of the New Regime by Faik Ahmet Bey	135
4.3.6. Mustafa Kemal Pasha’s National Tour and Speeches in Samsun and Trabzon	137
4.3.7. The End of the First First Year of the Republican Regime	141
4.3.8. Opening of the Second Term of The Second Assembly	142
4.3.9. The New Electoral Law	44
4.4. The Crises of the People’s Party and Formation of the Progressive Republican Party	146

4.4.1. Resignation of Pashas	146
4.4.2. The Opposition Organizes	148
4.4.3. The Road to the Formation of the Progressive Republican Party	152
4.4.4. Formation of the Progressive Party and Faik Ahmet Bey's Active Role	155
4.4.5. The End of the Ismet Pasha Government and the New Fethi Bey Cabinet	157
4.4.6. The Party Programme of the Progressive Party	60
4.4.7. Mustafa Kemal Pasha's Reaction to the New Party	165
4.4.8. The Byelections of 1924	167
4.5.1925 Political Events and End of the Faik Ahmet Bey's Articles	169
4.5.1. The Crises Between Recep Bey and Fethi Bey	169
4.5.2. Progressive Party - People's Party Relations	171
4.5.3 Closing Down of the Toksöz Newspaper	174
4.5.4 Faik Ahmet Bey's Last Criticisms	178
4.5.5. The Law on the Maintenance of Order Period	179
CONCLUDING REMARKS	182
BIBLIOGRAPHY	184

INTRODUCTION

The historical period between 1920 and 1926 was also the period of the Intra-elite conflicts in Turkish History. The National Struggle was formed by a coalition of elites from different ideological backgrounds, with those ideologies represented on the First National Assembly. After the great internal struggles at the First National Assembly and the murder of Trabzon delegate Ali Şükrü Bey during the declaration of the Republican Regime, the Second Group was eliminated. Mustafa Kemal Pasha demanded the formation of a new Assembly consisting of his colleagues and with a more homogenous structure. These changes caused widespread discontent within the Turkish elite and the cadres, which formed the national struggle movement. Faik Ahmet Barutçu Bey, owner of the Istikbal Newspaper, was one of the members of the elite which showed its hostility. Faik Ahmet Bey actively joined the national struggle and was a founding member of the one of the earliest branches of the Society for the Defence of National Rights (in Trabzon). He also participated in the formation of the Erzurum Congress. Until 1923, during the active struggle, he supported Mustafa Kemal Pasha; and for the sake of the unity of the movement, Faik Ahmet Bey did not join the struggles inside the Assembly. He had close relations with the members of the First Group and the Second Group.

Faik Ahmet Bey's neutrality towards the two groups within the Assembly changed after the murder of Ali Şükrü Bey and he started to follow the Second Group's ideological package, which included sovereignty of the people, freedom of speech, liberalism and the freedom of conscience. This was a major shift in Faik Ahmet Bey's political life. He was a republican who was not pleased with the new regime which, according to him, was disrespectful to the ideals he pursued. Later on he also joined the Progressive Republican Party because he considered that the new Party shared his ideals.

The main object of this thesis is to understand the major ideological changes which occurred in Faik Ahmet Bey's political life, and to trace the pathway which led

him to create an opposition to the new regime. In order to do that, the study starts with the evaluation of the studies made about Trabzon, Faik Ahmet Barutçu and the Istikbal Newspaper, and focuses on the main aspects of the academic studies on the subject and Turkish historical writing. We will then discuss the general image created for Trabzon during the national struggle. Later, it will continue with the fundamental role played by Faik Ahmet Bey during the National Struggle Movement. And show his support for the unity of the movement and his main ideas before the declaration of the republican regime.

The second chapter starts with the significant role played by Faik Ahmet Barutçu during the formation of the Society for the Defence of National rights in Trabzon. It continues with the formation of the Istikbal Newspaper. The chapter also concentrates on the political opinions of Faik Ahmet Bey up to the time of the murder of Ali Şükrü Bey.

The third chapter starts with the main ideological package followed by Faik Ahmet Bey at Istikbal Newspaper between the years 1923-1925. Faik Ahmet Bey used that package until his articles stopped in 1925, and he used the package to comment on the political incidents of his time. The third chapter continues with the major events of 1923 which alienated Faik Ahmet Bey from the new regime. His reaction to the formation of a republican regime is debated and his general views on the new regime are defined.

The last chapter focuses on the 1924-1925 political incidents and Faik Ahmet Bey's reaction to them. The chapter focuses on the opposition of Faik Ahmet Bey to the new regime coming onto the scene. Faik Ahmet Bey's general views on republicanism, sovereignty of the people and the multi-party regime are defined. The chapter continues with the 1925 events, which brought about the closing down of the newspaper.

CHAPTER 1. THE GENERAL EVALUATION OF THE CURRENT STUDIES ON TRABZON, FAİK AHMET BARUTÇU AND THE İSTİKBAL NEWSPAPER:

1.1. STUDIES ON FAİK AHMET BARUTÇU, İSTİKBAL NEWSPAPER AND TRABZON'S NATIONAL STRUGGLE:

In order to understand Faik Ahmet Barutçu's opposition between 1923 and 1925, we have to deeply analyse the main points of the recent studies on the history of Trabzon. Opposition is a problematic topic for the Turkish historians. Any political opposition is generally defined as treason in Turkish Political History studies, and this is particularly true for the history of the Trabzon during the National Struggle and Early Republican Period. The opponent position of the *Society for the Defence of the National Rights in Trabzon* (SDNR-T) during the National Struggle, Faik Ahmet Barutçu and İstikbal Newspaper, caused a great amount of accusation and gave rise to many different explanations in many different studies. For every single recorded incident about Trabzon, hundreds of different points of views can be found and it is very easy to become confused. In order to reduce the confusion, we have to compile the studies on Trabzon and debate the general points of view in Turkish historical writing about the opposition of Trabzon. The first part of this chapter deals with the studies made on SDNR-T, Faik Ahmet Barutçu and İstikbal Newspaper. The common points or differences in the studies are researched. And the common results of the studies are mentioned. The second part deals with the major incidents which contributed to the creation of the negative image of SDNR-T, Faik Ahmet Barutcu and İstikbal Newspaper. All of the sources quoted and incidents referred to are great examples of how Turkish historical writing views Trabzon's role. In the third chapter the historical legacies of all the studies on Faik Ahmet Bey and İstikbal Newspaper are debated.

When we focus on the academic historical studies, we see that Asuman Demircioğlu's unpublished PhD is the only academic study on the İstikbal newspaper

and Faik Ahmet Barutçu¹. The thesis is about Faik Ahmet Bey's articles in the *Istikbal* newspaper between the years 1919 and 1922. Demircioğlu starts his study at the beginning of the national struggle and continues until the end of it. He gives the opinions, reactions and views of Faik Ahmet Bey towards to the significant events of the period. Primary sources from *Istikbal* Newspaper are used in the study. Demircioğlu researched Faik Ahmet Bey's articles, which were on home politics, foreign affairs, treaties and social questions. From the beginning, the study tries to attribute a strong position during the national struggle to Faik Ahmet Bey and stresses his importance for the movement. Demircioğlu defines Faik Ahmet Bey as a significant intellectual who assumed important duties during the national struggle period, and defines his contributions to the formation of the national movement in Trabzon, and the formation of the SDNR-T². Faik Ahmet Bey was a great supporter of the national independence war and was instrumental in its outbreak. As a result of their efforts, Trabzon's national struggle movement had already begun when Mustafa Kemal Pasha reached Samsun. He published a newspaper in order to influence public opinion towards the national struggle movement and was the one of the first to ask for the formation of the Erzurum Congress³ and support its decisions. According to Demircioğlu, Faik Ahmet Bey was against the policies of the Istanbul governments and accused them of collaboration with foreign powers. He opposed the declaration of the Serves Treaty. He supported the formation of the National Assembly in Ankara, and after its formation he tried to introduce guiding principles to the Assembly. He vigorously defended the Assembly's policies⁴. From the beginning he supported the National Pact and the total independence of the country and his support continued without any change until the end of 1922. Demircioğlu also states that Faik Ahmet Bey supported the constitutional draft presented to the Assembly by Mustafa Kemal Pasha on 13 September 1920 and was satisfied by its acceptance.

Faik Ahmet Bey's political opinions are also included in the study. According to Demircioğlu, Faik Ahmet Bey supported the sovereignty of the people and disapproved

¹ Demircioğlu, Asuman, *Faik Ahmet Barutçu (Bey) ve Istikbal gazetesi (1918 Yılı Sonu ve 1922 Yılı)*, Unpublished PhD., Ankara: 2001.

² Demircioğlu 40.

³ Demircioğlu 406.

⁴ Demircioğlu 143.

of the monarchy. In his opinion, the ancien regime and its administration was alienated from the people's thoughts and ignorant of their demands and there was a huge gap between the rulers and the ruled. The regime was working in favour of the rulers. And because of that he perceived the new constitution and the new structure as an equitable populist event, which was prepared for the needs of the people. Faik Ahmet Bey was, however, opposed to extreme populism, conservatism, and supporters of the Enver Pasha. He was opposed to the İstiklal group, Tesanüd Group, Islahat Group and Müdafaa-i Hukuk Group formed at the First Assembly because of their radical popularism⁵. Faik Ahmet Bey rejected the radical interpretations of populism and saw them as harmful to national unity. For him, populism was to connect the people to the government and allow them to share the administration, and to help the people have a bearing on their own fate. But its extreme versions were disastrous. According to Demircioğlu, Faik Ahmet Bey was against neither populism nor revolutionism, but he was against extremism. Along with populism, he also supported public liberties, although he was opposed to excessive liberties. Even democracy and revolutions had to be moulded according to the political and social characteristics of the society. He was also against any reactionaries desiring a return to the old regime⁶. From the study it is also understood that the formation of the *Society for the National Rights of Anatolia and Rumelia Group* at the Assembly by Mustafa Kemal Pasha was seen as an advantageous event by Faik Ahmet Bey because of its connective and binding capacities⁷. He agreed with Mustafa Kemal Pasha's policy and mentioned that the formation of political groups was a necessity of parliamentary life.

Demircioğlu's study connotes Faik Ahmet Bey as a conciliatory member of the national struggle movement, who was not involved in any political conflicts. In his study, Demircioğlu generally fails to deal with the infighting which occurred in the national struggle movement. The author describes the conflict which occurred between Mustafa Kemal Pasha and the Trabzon delegates on the Erzurum Congress as an "insignificant" one⁸. And Faik Ahmet Bey's criticism is mentioned only once: when the

⁵ Demircioğlu 255-258.

⁶ Demircioğlu 64

⁷ Demircioğlu.264.

⁸ Demircioğlu 97.

National Assembly elections were delayed in 1921. Faik Ahmet Bey blamed the delay on the infighting in the Assembly and voiced his discontent⁹. Even though the conflicts, infighting and opposition to the national struggle period was kept outside the scope of Demirođlu's study, it is understood that, between 1918-1922, for Faik Ahmet Bey the success of the national struggle was more important than any temporary or trivial conflicts. He tried to be, and appears to have been, an equitable and neutral figure who refused to take part in infighting and conflicts. Faik Ahmet Bey conducted an appeasement policy, and tried to consolidate the movement. To achieve this goal, he voiced no criticism of the government and didn't act against it. He perceived as harmful any stress within the movement and sometimes showed his discomfort with the opponents. But from Demirciođlu's study it is also understood that there were significant differences between the Istikbal newspaper and Faik Ahmet Bey in the periods 1918-1922 and 1923-1925. During the Early Republican Period, Faik Ahmet Bey transformed himself from the neutral and solidarity-demanding intellectual into a significant leader of the opposition, and eventually became head of the Trabzon local branch of the Progressive Republican Party.

Demirciođlu's study does not give any clues about the transformation of Faik Ahmet Bey from mild intellectual into opposition leader, possibly due to the author's desire to reflect Faik Ahmet Bey as a helpful and binding patriot who served for the good of his country and abstained from criticism in order to preserve national unity. But more than that, it was a choice made by Faik Ahmet Bey. The roots of his opposition were not sown during the national struggle era, but rather there was a new direction taken early in 1923, after the murder of the Trabzon deputy Ali Őukr Bey.

Mesut apa's study is a biography of Faik Ahmet Barutcu from the National Struggle to the end of his life¹⁰ and is a unique study on this topic. Together with the political life of Faik Ahmet Bey, apa also gives particular importance to his thinking. The study also contains almost exclusively primary sources from the Istikbal Newspaper. Mesut apa translated parts of the Istikbal Newspaper and based his

⁹ Demirciođlu 116.

¹⁰ apa, Mesut, Faik Ahmet Barutcu Hayatı ve KiŐiliđi, (Trabzon: T .C. Trabzon Valiliđi İl Kltr Mdrlđ 1998).

hypothesis on these primary sources. As a result, the study not only deals with the political chronology of Faik Ahmet Bey but is a complete study of an intellectual figure.

The main problem with the study is that Çapa did not focus on Faik Ahmet Bey's opposition years. Even though the study touches on many points (National Struggle, revolutions, transition to the multi-party regime and Democratic Party years) Faik Ahmet Bey's opposition to the new regime is barely mentioned and his opposition years (1923-1925) are bypassed quickly. Çapa tried to balance the opposition of Faik Ahmet Bey with his heroic importance in the formation of the national struggle movement in Trabzon. So, according to Çapa, even though Faik Ahmet Bey turned out to be member of the opposition movement, Progressive Republican Party and Democratic Party, he was not a traitor or a counter-revolutionary because he was a founder of the National Struggle. The general tone of the study is as such.

The first part of Çapa's study deals with Faik Ahmet Bey's political life. Çapa starts his study by discussing Faik Ahmet Bey's significant role in the national struggle period which was the most important period of his life.¹¹ He was a journalist, writer and a public orator who strongly supported the national struggle movement, and he was the main founder of the SDNR-T. This society was formed in order to start the movement and fight against the Greek and Armenian Political Societies. According to Çapa, Istikbal Newspaper was established in order to diffuse the views of the Trabzon Society. Çapa sincerely believed that Istikbal was a newspaper which was only formed with the aim of supporting the national struggle. In his opinion, Istikbal fought against the Greek and Armenian Political events, and fuelled the excitement of National Struggle in Trabzon. Faik Ahmet Bey was a hot-blooded public orator and a guide who made emotional public speeches and acted as a leader and a guide to the people with his clenched fists and feverish speeches. To preserve Faik Ahmet Bey's reputation, Çapa gives very little space to his opposition in the study. Çapa mentions his Progressive Party years in five paragraphs, and briefly dicusses his opposition years (1923-1925) in 9 pages.

Çapa describes Faik Ahmet Bey's Progressive Party years as a short and unsuccessful incident. Çapa believed that the New Party formed after the divisions in

¹¹ Çapa 13.

the Second Assembly. And Faik Ahmet Bey joined the Trabzon branch of the new party. But Çapa does not give a detailed answer as to why Faik Ahmet Barutçu joined the Progressive Party, and he mentions a brief speech made by Faik Ahmet Bey during the opening of the Trabzon branch of the New Party. Çapa says that, in this speech, Faik Ahmet Bey discussed the necessity of libertarianism and national sovereignty, and declared that a new free life, which depended on the people's self-rule, was on the horizon. Later on, Çapa also writes how the *Istikbal* Newspaper closed down for a brief period after the Seikh Said rebellion.

On an intellectual level, Çapa also underlines Faik Ahmet Bey's intellectual contributions to the national struggle. According to Çapa, Faik Ahmet Bey's political ideas were based on securing national unity inside the country. His ultimate aim was to create a feeling of unity inside the nation. And in order to achieve this unity; he strongly supported the formation of the National Assembly¹². Çapa states that Faik Ahmet also supported Mustafa Kemal Pasha's creation of *the National Defence* Group in the Assembly. According to Faik Ahmet Bey, without the political groups in the Assembly, no political life could be achieved.

According to Çapa, Faik Ahmet Bey turned to the opposition because of the Ali Şükrü Bey incident, abolishment of the First National Assembly and the transition of the Society of the Defence of the National Rights into the People's Party. Çapa believed that Faik Ahmet Bey was devoted to the national struggle from the beginning, but after these events he joined the ranks of the journalists for the opposition. In his view, Faik Ahmet Bey openly blamed Ankara for the murder of Ali Şükrü Bey¹³. He joined the SDNR-T's resistance to the transition to People's Party and supported SDNR's because they had been founded by the people.

Çapa's study defines Faik Ahmet Bey's political views as underpinned by the principles of individual freedom, sovereignty of the people, and the superiority of the Assembly. Despite giving Faik Ahmet Bey's opposition little space, this study seems to be one of most accurate one about him. Çapa uses primary sources, discusses Faik Ahmet Bey's articles and gives quotations from them. He abstains from personal

¹² Çapa 16-33.

¹³ Çapa 35-36.

interpretations and makes use of primary sources but the study deals very briefly with the opposition, which is discussed in just nine pages.

Trabzon's role during the National Struggle is researched in detail in Dr Sabahattin Özel's study¹⁴. Özel starts from the Russian occupation of the City and examines the events. Özel used a package of primary and secondary resources in the study and therefore presents new information on the subject. The balance of primary/secondary sources could be seen as unequal in some chapters but it must be said that Özel's study is the principal study needed to understand the period.

According to Özel, the early roots of the SDNR-T sprang from the Russian occupation¹⁵ and the Society was formed in order to oppose the Greek and Armenian Political Organizations formed in the city. Özel believed that the Christian Georgians were also a threat for Trabzon, and he asserts that a special contribution came from the former Unionists in the formation of the Society. Namely, the Unionist Secret Service "Special Organization" played a significant role in its creation¹⁶. But until the formation of the Istikbal Newspaper, the Society's activities were insignificant. With the publication of Istikbal, the national struggle movement gained a voice in Trabzon.

Özel's study deals in particular with the Enver Pasha and Trabzon conflict. It is one of the most detailed explanations of the incident. And after defining the role of the Society in the formation of the movement of Trabzon, Özel mentions the Enver Pasha incident. According to Özel, Halil Pasha was sent to Trabzon with a letter by Enver Pasha in order to inspect *The People's Soviets Party* but was denied entry to the city by colonel Nuri Bey. The local notables protected Halil Pasha, and they rejected the Ankara Government's refusal. But Mustafa Kemal Pasha and his colleagues decided on the deportation of Hilmi Pasha and criticized his relations with the *The People's Soviets Party*, denouncing his visit as being for the purpose of inspecting the Party. Persuaded by Yahya Captain, Hilmi then left Trabzon.

Özel believed that the supporters of Enver Pasha in Trabzon were extremely powerful and in his study we are even led to believe that the whole city was behind him. Enver Pasha's supporters are described as prepared to take power from Mustafa Kemal

¹⁴ Özel, Sabahattin, Milli Mücadele' de Trabzon, (Ankara: TTK, 1991).

¹⁵ Özel 23.

¹⁶ Özel 52.

Pasha. Özel also asserts that the Yahya Captain was supported by the SDNR-T and its leader Barutçuzade Hacı Ahmet. Ali Şükrü Bey and Barutçuzade tried to prevent Yahya Captain's arrest and sent telegrams to Kazım Karabekir. According to Özel, Yahya Captain was so powerful that he could even form a government. And his and other Unionist's activities in Trabzon were stopped by the collaboration of the non-Unionist local notables of Trabzon and the Ankara Government. Özel also tells us that the *Güzel Trabzon* Newspaper was established by the local notables opposed to the *Istikbal* Newspaper.

In his study Özel stresses the SDNR-T's role in the formation of national struggle. And this emphasis seems to be an excuse for Trabzon's opposition activities. The writer attempts to explain that the Trabzon Society was in opposition, but it also helped the formation of the movement. And he concludes the study by proposing that even though some conflicts occurred between Mustafa Kemal Pasha and SDNR-T, they were resolved by the non-Unionists of Trabzon¹⁷.

1.2. THE MAIN POINTS OF THE STUDIES ON TRABZON'S OPPOSITION:

Trabzon's opposition is still a topic which needs further research. The rising studies about the opposition and opposition figures still fail to include Trabzon. İsmail Akbal's PhD. dissertation is the only academic study of the opposition of Trabzon in National Struggle period¹⁸. From social to political, Akbal examines every aspect of Trabzon's opposition and uses a large amount of primary sources and copies of *Istikbal* Newspaper. Akbal begins his study from the Unionism and Trabzon argument, and gives a very detailed analysis of the subject. Akbal was sure of the Unionism of Trabzon and, according to him, the local notables of Trabzon joined the Union and Progress Party. Akbal gives a social reason for this; Trabzon notables demanded state power in order to conduct international trade. These Unionist notables started to rule the

¹⁷ Özel 155-162.

¹⁸ Akbal, İsmail, 1919-1923 Yılları Arasında Muhallif Kimliğiyle Trabzon, Unpublished PhD. Thesis, Ankara: 2004.

civil services and control the whole city as well as its educational life and the curriculum of schools started to become pro-Unionist. Trabzon thus became a city of Unionism. Akbal believed that Unionism was the dominant factor, which created crises between Mustafa Kemal Pasha and SDNR-T in the years 1919-1923. Akbal also maintains that the Unionists all along formed the Societies for the Defence of the National Rights.

Akbal believed that from the beginning Enver Pasha had a dominant authority over Trabzon. And starting from 1914, with Enver Pasha's efforts, Trabzon became the central base of Unionism together with Caucasia, Erzurum and Van. With the merging of the Gandermarie battalions of Trabzon, Artvin, Giresun, Rize and Hopa, a Secret Organization (Teşkilat-i Mahsusa) Battalion formed in Trabzon. It was commanded by Yusuf Rıza Bey, and the Erzurum battalion was commanded by Bahattin Şakir¹⁹. Akbal believed that later on, when Enver Pasha decided to pass from Caucasia to Trabzon during 1920, he trusted these cadres. And Akbal also mentioned that, by the will of Enver Pasha, during the formation of the Southern North Caucasia Government (Cenub-i Şarki Kafkas Hükümeti) commander of Trabzon Battalion Ali Rıza Bey and former Trabzon regional chief of the Secret Organization Hacı Ahmet Barutçu²⁰.

On the subject of the formation of the SDNR-T and Istikbal Newspaper, Akbal followed the Secondary Sources, no new information is presented. SDNR-T was formed by the former Unionists opposed to the Greek Organizations and Istikbal was the Society's Official publication. Regarding the Erzurum Congress, Akbal states that Mustafa Kemal Pasha had no part in the gathering of the Congress; it was the Trabzon and Erzurum Societies who arranged it²¹. And for the opposition of the Trabzon delegates to Mustafa Kemal Pasha, Akbal gives the standard information. The Trabzon delegates rejected the entrance of the Mustafa Kemal Pasha and Rauf Bey to the Congress as Delegates of the Istanbul Society²², and their joining was criticized for this reason. But Akbal adds some very significant information and writes that the Trabzon

¹⁹ Akbal 22-39.

²⁰ Faik Ahmet Barutçu's father.

²¹ Akbal 97.

²² Trabzon delegates rejected the point that the Trabzon Society had no relations with the Society for the Defence of the Eastern Provinces (Vilayet-i ŞarkiyeMüdafaa-i Hukuk Cemiyeti) formed on Istanbul. And they rejected the Istanbul Society's leadership to the Congress.

delegates who rejected Mustafa Kemal's membership were the members of the Liberty and Entente Party (Hürriyet ve Itilaf Firkasi). According to Akbal, the same Ententist delegates also objected to Mustafa Kemal Pasha joining the Conference in Military Uniform. They were concerned that the Pasha's uniform could create military dominance over the Conference and, in order to avoid conflict, the Pasha eventually abandoned military uniform and adopted civilian attire. Akbal also mentions that the Pasha's election as the Chairman of the Congress was protested by the same delegates, a group of whom refused to take part in the election. Akbal gives the names of Ali Naci (Duyduk), Ömer Fevzi Bey, and Yusuf Ziya Bey, and confirms that the opponents were all Ententist²³. According to Akbal, these Ententist delegates also refused the election of the provincial chairman and county commissioners of the Eastern Anatolian Society for the Defence of the National Rights from governors, army officers or the kaimakams.

Akbal opines that all this opposition stemmed from social conflicts. The Erzurum Congress was gathered by the local notables who did not want the bureaucracy to gain more power over the congress. There were also different points of view among the participants; there was opposition to Mustafa Kemal Pasha's leadership and Decentralization supporters and Liberty and Entente followers were present in strength at the Conference²⁴.

Akbal believed that the opposition of the Trabzon delegates was the main incident which changed the whole political destiny of the city. According to Akbal, starting from the conference, Trabzon became marginalized and it continued in that way until the early republican period. All the incidents around Trabzon (the murder of İzzet Bey, the Trabzon Delegate of the First Assembly, the position of the Trabzon delegates in the First Assembly, Enver Pasha-Mustafa Kemal Pasha relations, the murder of Yahya Captain and TCP leader Mustafa Suphi and Ali Şükrü Bey) can be traced to the effect of the Congress²⁵. Unlike the other studies Akbal also writes that, after the congress the opponents were forcibly silenced by the Lame Osman. The opposition of the Trabzon delegates to Mustafa Kemal Pasha continued, however at the Sivas

²³ Akbal 114-116.

²⁴ Akbal 145-151.

²⁵ Akbal 132.

Conference, with none of them attending. Akbal believed that it was Kazım Karabekir Pasha who encouraged the opponents of Mustafa Kemal Pasha²⁶.

Akbal argues that with the end of the Damat Ferit Pasha government and the end of the Liberty and Entente Party, ententists of SDNR-T lost their power in the Society, and the members became Unionists. But these cadres did not accept Mustafa Kemal Pasha's leadership in the national struggle, preferring to follow Enver Pasha²⁷. Akbal also mentions that together with the murder of the new elected Trabzon deputy Eyüpzade İzzet Bey, the distance grew between Trabzon and Mustafa Kemal Pasha.

Akbal also gives great detail about the Enver Pasha's activities in Trabzon and points out that SDNR-T, Trabzon's local notables all supported the Captain Yahya and Enver Pasha. Even the Lame Osman was under the control of Enver Pasha, and Ali Şükrü Bey was a Unionist²⁸. The Trabzon cadre was actually using propaganda to promote Enver Pasha among the people. Yahya Captain formed the Unionist Government in Trabzon (İskele Hükümeti) and the Ankara Government and Mustafa Kemal Pasha refused Enver Pasha permission to pass to Anatolia through Trabzon. Akbal also pays great attention to the Ali Şükrü Bey murder. According to Akbal, Ali Şükrü Bey was murdered by Lame Osman. Ali Şükrü Bey opposed many of the Assembly's decisions. Akbal tells us that Ali Şükrü Bey rejected the transition to the regular army and bill proposing the extension of the supreme commander's power, and was opposed to the formation of Independence Courts and the abolition of the Sultanate. He also criticised the Lausanne Policy²⁹. Lame Osman eventually murdered him for political reasons. Concerning Ali Şükrü Bey's murder, Akbal follows the standard version that Ali Şükrü Bey was killed by Lame Osman and that Mustafa Kemal Pasha was not involved in the incident.

Ismail Akbal's study is the only one about the opposition of Trabzon. With his use of primary sources and newspapers Akbal makes a very strong study of the incident. But, also he paints a very combative image of SDNR-T, Faik Ahmet Bey and Istikbal Newspaper. SDNR-T and Istikbal thus appear as very independent factions in the

²⁶ Akbal 195.

²⁷ Akbal 188.

²⁸ Akbal 344.

²⁹ Akbal 452-468.

National Struggle which never agreed with Ankara and Mustafa Kemal Pasha. And Akbal never actually mentioned the agreements between the two centers. Even though Trabzon opposed Ankara and the Pasha, they were a part of the national struggle movement and the Defence of the National Rights Group. And Trabzon had close relations with the Pasha.

Moreover, Faik Ahmet Bey and Istikbal newspaper are described as disobedient and always independent and Faik Ahmet Bey's articles are used exiguously in the study. Faik Ahmet Bey, however, wrote a great amount of articles, which supported Mustafa Kemal Pasha, the Ankara Government and the unity of the National Struggle Movement.

In addition, Akbal's study deals with the period 1919 to 1923. These were not Faik Ahmet Bey's open opposition years. His opposition started with the murder of Ali Şükrü Bey. Akbal's study gives a very detailed background to the opposition of Trabzon, but his study doesn't change the necessity of a further study of Faik Ahmet Barutçu between 1923 and 1925. Akbal's study is limited to the National Struggle Movement.

Mahmut Goloğlu is the other author who gives significance to the relations between Mustafa Kemal Pasha and Trabzon. He produced a study of the main dynamics of the relations. Goloğlu's study is not as detailed as Ismail Akbal's, and it seems to be an apology for Trabzon's oppositions. The book *Milli Mücadelede Mustafa Kemal Pasha ve Trabzon* was the result of this research³⁰. Goloğlu started from the formation of the SDNR-T. Goloğlu started with the Unionism of the society. According to him, the leading Unionist local notables of Trabzon formed the society in order to start the national struggle movement in Trabzon and the Istikbal Newspaper was the main organ to expand and broadcast Society's views to Trabzon. So, from the beginning Goloğlu defines the Newspaper as a Unionist one which was formed and published by the Unionists of Trabzon. After outlining SDNR-T's success, Goloğlu discusses its significant role during the formation of the Erzurum Congress. His opinion is that the Congress was gathered thanks to the efforts of the Trabzon branch. Goloğlu also mentions the Trabzon delegates' opposition to Mustafa Kemal Pasha's Presidency of

³⁰ Goloğlu, Mahmut, *Milli Mücadelede Trabzon ve Mustafa Kemal Pasha*, Trabzon: KTÜ, 1981.

the Congress. According to Golođlu, the Trabzon delegates led by Ömer Fevzi Eyüpođlu opposed Mustafa Kemal Pasha because he was a former soldier and they believed that the Pasha should not be the President of a civilian congress³¹. But Golođlu adds that the opposition was confronted by another Trabzon delegate, İzzet Eyüpođlu, and his friends who supported Mustafa Kemal Pasha's presidency. With the help of Kazım Karabekir Pasha, he was elected. Golođlu mentions that all the Trabzon delegates supported Mustafa Kemal Pasha on the 1st Assembly.

Particular focus is placed on Bolshevism and its relations with Trabzon. According to Golođlu, through the Bolshevik Green Army formed by the Muslim/Turks of Russia, Bolsheviks started to have a great influence on the National Struggle Movement. When the Bolsheviks announced their rejection of the creation of Armenian Turkish lands, its support doubled. But Golođlu believes that the strongest response to the emerging Bolshevik tendencies came from the Trabzon delegates and *Istikbal* Newspaper. It was mainly led by Trabzon delegate Ali Şükrü Bey. Golođlu believed that all the opposition of Trabzon against Bolshevism was influenced by Mustafa Kemal Pasha. The Pasha made declarations condemning the emerging Bolshevism in the country and Trabzon delegates supported him and adhered to these declarations.

Golođlu's study also deals with the Trabzon Problem and Enver Pasha's activities. According to Golođlu, the members of the SDNR-T were all Unionists including Trabzon delegate Ali Şükrü Bey. And they had strong relations with the former Unionist leaders who had fled the country after the end of the WWI. Enver Pasha, Halil Pasha and Küçük Talat Bey were the three important leaders who were supported by the Society. After the War, Enver Pasha and Küçük Talat Bey fled to Europe while Halil Pasha was sent to Caucasia by Mustafa Kemal Pasha in order to find support for the National Struggle. Later Küçük Talat Bey returned to Trabzon to take his family abroad and Halil Pasha also came to the city. At that time, Dr. Colonel İbrahim Tali Öngören also reported to Mustafa Kemal Pasha that the Enver Pasha wanted to come to Anatolia and lead the National Struggle Movement. And the report also added that Küçük Talat and Kuşçubaşızade Çerkes Hacı Sami had to be prosecuted. Later on it was understood that Enver Pasha was on the road to Trabzon, and leading

³¹ Golođlu 16-30.

Unionist Nail Bey also came to the city. Because Küçük Talat was also in Trabzon, it was thought that the former Unionist members wanted to join and lead the national struggle and start their movement from Trabzon³². During those days rumours circulated that the SDNR-T were becoming closer to their Unionist colleagues. The Sinop Delegate also sent a report to the Eastern Front Leadership. Inside the report it was written that the Russian State had a strong spy organisation in Trabzon and added that the Russians were attempting to work together with the Trabzon mobster Yahya Captain, master of the guild of boatmen. Trabzon therefore undully and needlessly became an urgent city for Ankara. Goloğlu is of the opinion that the SDNR-T didn't support Enver Pasha; they were strongly against his passage to Trabzon to Batumi. Yahya Captain never went to Batumi to meet with Enver Pasha. The Trabzon Delegate Hafiz Mehmet and Hopalı Hacışahinzade met with Enver Pasha and warned him that his passage could create divisions in the national struggle. Enver Pasha consequently decided to go to Turkestan.

Goloğlu also mentions that the Yahya Captain incident occurred because of the imagination and suspicions of Seyfi Bey, the Commander of the 13th division. He discovered letters to Yahya Captian under the pen name Ali, and the Commander thought they were from the Enver Pasha. He was also under the impression that the Enver Pasha was coming to Trabzon and would capture Ankara with the Yaha Captain's batallion. Seyfi Bey warned the Chief of the General Staff Fevzi Pasha (Çakmak) and he informed Kazım Karabekir. Kazım Pasha then ordered the Commander of Kars, Sami Sabit (Karaman), to start an investigation and make arrests in Trabzon.

Goloğlu believes that when the Yahya Captain incident was resolved, even though some members of the SDNR-T were unhappy with Sami Sabit Bey's attitude, a great majority of the Trabzon intellectuals felt glad when the tyranny of Yahya Captain ended. Indeed, a group of intellectuals rejected Faik Ahmet Bey's and Istikbal Newspaper's critics of Sami Sabit Bey and founded a counter newspaper to Istikbal, *Güzel Trabzon*, writing articles which blessed Sami Sabit Bey. According to Goloğlu, all these events, and Ali Şükrü Bey's murder were not taken seriously by the people of Trabzon, because they felt a great adherence to the Great Rescuer Mustafa Kemal

³² Goloğlu 30-50.

Pasha. And, because of his respect for Mustafa Kemal Pasha, the SDNR-T's new leader declared his loyalty to the Pasha.

Goloğlu relates that when the Republic was declared and Mustafa Kemal Pasha became the new President, natives of Trabzon celebrated the event joyfully with people taking to the streets and welcoming the Pasha's Presidency with excitement³³. Republican Trabzon united with the new President and the rescuer Mustafa Kemal Pasha also responded to the city with the same enthusiasm. And when the Pasha has died, the natives of Trabzon has never

As in Asuman Demircioğlu's study Goloğlu also tried to attribute a special position in the National Struggle to the SDNR-T. In the study Goloğlu highlights the significance of the SDNR-T in the formation of the National Struggle Movement. But the real reason behind his emphasis seems to be an apology for Trabzon's opposition. Goloğlu attempts to understate Trabzon's opposition and makes the apology by dividing the SDNR-T into different factions. In every opposition incident, Goloğlu remarks that a faction of the Society opposed and the rest of it rejected the opposition. Goloğlu thus represents the opposition as a marginal faction of the Society.

In addition to this, Goloğlu's study does not refer to the opposition of the SDNR-T, Trabzon delegates and Istikbal Newspaper, during the Republican Period. For the Republican Period, Goloğlu mentions the devotion of the Trabzon to Mustafa Kemal Pasha and the new regime. He ignores the events which occurred after the declaration of the Republic. Goloğlu's study is therefore deficient as regards the period 1923-1925.

The studies on Trabzon, Faik Ahmet Bey and Istikbal Newspaper had two general tones. One of the tones is seen in Asuman Demircioğlu's study. This type of study's general aim is to minimize the opposition of Trabzon. And a minimum of space is given to the conflicts between Trabzon and Mustafa Kemal Pasha and Trabzon and Ankara in general. Faik Ahmet Barutçu and Istikbal Newspaper are portrayed as patriotic, extremely nationalistic and very calm. The inner logic of these studies generally defines opposition as unpatriotic and un-nationalistic. It is perceived almost as a crime which must be denied. Mahmut Goloğlu's study is a great example of this logic. Both Demircioğlu and Goloğlu give a very little space or a limited space to opposition

³³Goloğlu 50-58.

in their studies. Or whenever a conflict is mentioned, they they attempt to show the importance of Trabzon during the National Struggle period.

On the other hand, Ismail Akbal's study is an example of the second type of writing which deals exclusively with the opposition. For the years 1919 to 1923, Akbal's study gives a very long analysis of the opposition of Trabzon and Trabzon, Istikbal Newspaper and Faik Ahmet Bey are seen as harsh opponents who were always in conflict with Ankara and Mustafa Kemal Pasha. Istikbal and Faik Ahmet Bey in particular are defined in that way. The study always gives examples of articles criticising the government. The articles which supported Ankara and Mustafa Kemal are not referred to in the study³⁴. So, contrary to Goloğlu and Demircioğlu Akbal's study focuses on the opposition.

The only study balancing these two tones belongs to Mesut Çapa. Çapa mentioned Trabzon's, Faik Ahmet Bey's and Istikbal's contributions to the formation of the National Struggle as well as their opposition. But Çapa's study is very brief and the incidents are not discussed in depth. The period between 1923 and 1925, which was Faik Ahmet Bey's open opposition period, took very little prominence in the study while Ismail Akbal's study embraces this period. Faik Ahmet Bey's opposition between 1923 and 1925 therefore requires further research and the ultimate aim of our study is to provide this.

1.3. THE COMMON ARGUMENTS IN TURKISH HISTORICAL WRITING ABOUT TRABZON:

Because of the significance of the incident, the National Struggle has found a special place in Turkish historical writing. From social to political, economic to diplomatic, every aspect of the subject has been studied many times. And a special language, or a special view of the events in Trabzon in Turkish historiography has developed. This language has repeated itself many times in different studies. Trabzon's opposition is examined, and indeed given particular significance, in many studies.

³⁴ When the general collection of Istikbal is researched it seems that between 1918-1923 Faik Ahmet Bey generally stayed neutral for the sake of the unity of the national struggle movement. Only a very limited number of critical articles written by him.

Trabzon's opposition included the issues of Unionism, opposition to Mustafa Kemal Pasha at the Erzurum Congress and Ali Şükrü Bey's murder and the Second Group. But of these topics, Unionism is the dominant issue associated with Trabzon in studies. The SDNR-T is most often referred to as a Unionist Society, and its opposition linked to its Unionism. The great majority of the studies defined the Unionism of Trabzon National Struggle Movement. SDNR-T as a society formed by former Union and Progress Party members and the majority of its members are referred to as Unionists and Enver Pasha supporters.

The SDNR-T, *Istikbal* Newspaper and Faik Ahmet Bey are commonly equated with Unionism in Turkish Political History and historical writing with *Istikbal* Newspaper described as the Official Newspaper of the Unionists of Trabzon and Faik Ahmet Bey as the Unionist journalist behind it. With this emphasis on Unionism, *Istikbal* Newspaper and Faik Ahmet Bey's publication policy has been attributed a Unionist tendency and *Istikbal* Newspaper's opposition has been perceived as a part of the Unionist agenda of the National Struggle Period. The real reasons for *Istikbal*'s opposition have not been afforded sufficient attention or studied adequately. Because the newspaper has been designated a Unionist one, its publication policy is generally perceived immediately by the Historian as a part of the Unionist discourses. *Istikbal* Newspaper's publication policy was harmonized to the Unionism of the SDNR-T. The prevailing point of view is that the SDNR-T, its leader Faik Ahmet Bey and *Istikbal* Newspaper were all former Unionists whose political inspiration stemmed from their Unionism. They were the remnants of the Union and Progress Party during the National Struggle Movement. They secretly wanted to bring the Unionist rule again, and the main reason behind their opposition was to achieve this. They never accepted Mustafa Kemal Pasha's leadership because they still supported the former Unionist leaders.

One of the oldest studies to deal with the role of the Unionists during the National Struggle and the SDNR-T's Unionism is Sabahattin Selek's *Anadolu İhtilali*, which was published in 1963 for the first time³⁵. According to Selek, before the beginning of the National Struggle Movement the *Union and Progress Party* held its last meeting and closed down between 14 and 19 November 1918. The Unionists

³⁵ Selek, Sabahattin, *Anadolu İhtilali*, 1 Vols, İstanbul: Kastaş, 2004.

decided to form a new party under the name *Renovation Party* to continue their political struggle. But after the signing of the armistice, the Unionists fell from power and started to lose political strength. At the same time, in the early days of 1918 three leaders of the party Talat, Enver and Cemal left the country and other members of the Party started to lose power due to pressure from the British. With the Unionists' power declining, the National Defence Society was formed in order to start a National Struggle movement. Selek mentions that the great majority of Societies were formed by the local Unionists, including the Trabzon Society³⁶. For him the majority of the societies were Unionists who were trying to hide their member's identities in order to hide their Unionism. According to Selek even the army officers who joined the National Struggle were Unionists. Selek believed that the Unionists always carried their hidden agendas and they were always secretly in touch with Enver Pasha, but it was Trabzon in particular which supplied the contact between Enver Pasha and Unionists nationwide³⁷. Trabzon was the main centre of Unionism. Selek also mentioned that during the formation of the new regime, the Unionists caused great conflicts and arguments and in the end they attempted to seize power and the government. Selek draws a very negative picture of the Unionists and attributes to Trabzon a very negative role. Selek also added the SDNR-T as a Unionist organization which was very active during the national struggle era. For him, the SDNR-T was the main organization which pursued Unionist goals.

Doğan Avcıoğlu defined Trabzon's position more precisely³⁸. According to him, Trabzon and the SDNR-T certainly supported Unionism and Enver Pasha. Trabzon was the Anatolian base for Unionists and Enver Pasha. Unionism in Trabzon was allowed by Yahya Captain and the SDNR-T leader Hacı Ahmet Barutçu, and they tried to form a Unionist National Struggle Movement. Avcıoğlu maintains that the Unionists' aim was to create an Anatolian Revolution and take power from Mustafa Kemal Pasha using Trabzon as a base. With the help of the Trabzon SDNR, Enver would start an insurrection³⁹.

³⁶ Selek 91-102.

³⁷ Selek 614.

³⁸ Avcıoğlu, Doğan, *Milli Kurtuluş Tarihi*, 2 Vols, İstanbul: Tekin, 2001.

³⁹ Avcıoğlu 527-544.

Avcıoğlu's detail is continued by Mete Tunçay's study⁴⁰. According to Tunçay, Unionists like Küçük Talat and Nail Bey were organizing in Trabzon with a view to executing pro-Soviet policies making their statements through Istikbal Newspaper⁴¹. Trabzon's Unionist tendencies during the National Struggle are treated as a kind of high treason by the studies on the topic. According to this kind of historiography, Trabzon didn't support Mustafa Kemal Pasha and chose Unionist leaders such as Küçük Talat or Enver Pasha, which is considered as high treason; Trabzon was unfaithful and prepared to betray. This is best described in Sami Sabit Karaman's memoirs:

The members of the Society contained one of the leading Unionists, Küçük Talat. There's no need to say any more about the members of the Society for the Defence of the National Rights of Trabzon and the Society's real aims⁴².

The role of the former Union and Progress Party during the organization of the national struggle has begun to gain more space in recent studies. And the SDNR-T's and Istikbal Newspaper's Unionism has begun to be defined more clearly in these studies. Selek's point of view is supported by the new studies, which redefined the roles of the Unionists at the start of the National Struggle Movement. Erik Jan Zürcher was also one of the historians who strongly defined the SDNR-T's Unionism. According to Zürcher, Istikbal's Unionism was very clear. Zürcher contends that Societies for the Defence of the National Rights and Turkish National Struggle Movement strongly denied their Unionist connections from the very beginning of the national struggle and worked hard to end the perception that their movement's identification with the Union and Progress and societies explicitly stated their independence from Unionism. Zürcher also, however, mentions the Unionist contribution to the start of the national resistance movement. According to him, although Societies for the Defence of the National Rights deeply denied any Unionism, Unionists contributed significantly to the start of the national resistance movement through open and underground political activities, the role

⁴⁰ Tunçay, Mete, Türkiye'de Cumhuriyeti'nde Tek Parti Yönetiminin Kurulması, İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı, 2005.

⁴¹ Tunçay 77.

⁴² Karaman, Sami Sabit, İstiklal mücadelesi ve Enver Pasha: Trabzon ve Kars hatıraları 1921-1922, (İzmir: Selüloz, 19??) 19.

of the provincial branches and through the military. In Erik Jan Zürcher's study, the SDNR-T is portrayed as a Unionist organization, and *Istikbal* newspaper as a Unionist newspaper⁴³. In the book, the SDNR-T is defined as an organization formed by well-known Unionist officials and patriotic youngsters.

More than Zürcher, Bayram Sakallı focuses intensely on the Unionism of SDNR-T, considering the Unionism of the society as a source of struggle within the national struggle movement. Sakallı describes the SDNR-T in his study *Milli Mücadelenin Sosyal Tarihi: Müdafaa-i Hukuk Cemiyetleri* as a Unionist society. He is of the opinion that the Trabzon elite split into Unionists and Accordists. The leading Unionist families of Trabzon (Barutçuzadeler, Nemlizadeler and Abonozzadeler) formed the SDNR-T. Sakallı declares that together with Mustafa Kemal Pasha, other leaders of the national struggle movement were actively opposed to the SDNR-T due to the fear of Bolshevism passing into Anatolia from Trabzon, or the fear of Unionist leaders Talat, Cemal, and especially Enver gaining the support of the Unionists to take leadership of the movement⁴⁴. Sakallı writes that the SDNR-T was in conflict with Mustafa Kemal Pasha from the beginning of the Erzurum Congress. And the SDNR-T's activities, which advocated Enver Pasha and disregarded the Ankara Government, forced the Ankara government to take measures against Trabzon.

In Emel Akal's study the SDNR-T and *Istikbal* newspaper are also considered to be a part of Unionism. Akal describes the SDNR-T as an organization formed by the strong local Unionist elite of Trabzon. According to Akal, Trabzon was an opponent of Mustafa Kemal and a supporter of Enver Pasha⁴⁵. Akal also describes *Istikbal* as a Unionist newspaper, formed by the *Teşkilat-i Mahsusa* and Union and Progress Party. According to her study, *Istikbal* was a staunchly Unionist newspaper and the power of the Unionists and *Teşkilat-ı Mahsusa* members in Trabzon stemmed from the period before WWI, and they remained in opposition to Mustafa Kemal until the death of Enver Pasha. Because Trabzon was a frontier city, Enver Pasha, who was a member of the local Soviet movement, and his supporters could easily sneak back into the city. Akal

⁴³ Zürcher, Erik Jan, *The Unionist factor : the role of the Committee of Union and Progress in the Turkish National Movement 1905-1926*, (Leiden: Brill, 1984) 72-92.

⁴⁴ Sakallı, Bayram, *Milli Mücadelenin Sosyal Tarihi*, (İstanbul: İz Yayıncılık, 1997) 182.

⁴⁵ Akal, Emel, *Milli Mücadelenin Başlangıcında Mustafa Kemal İttihat Terakki ve Bolşevizm*, (İstanbul: TÜSTAV, 2006) 237.

also states that Halil Pasha, Küçük Talat, Yenibahçeli Nail, Naim Cevat, Kazım Bey (Enver Pasha's uncle by marriage), Seyfi, Ali Rıza, and Yahya Captain, all leading figures in the SDNR-T, were political employees of Enver Pasha. She explains that, because the Chairman of the SDNR-T –Barutçuzade Ahmet Efendi– was also the former Trabzon Chairman of the Union and Progress's *Teşkilat-ı Mahsusa*, the Unionists of Trabzon were able to increase their activities. It is explained in the study that after their participation in the end of the Baku Congress of the People of the East (20 October 1920), leading supporters of the Enver Pasha Küçük Talat and Nail Bey came to Trabzon and gained total control of the SDNR-T⁴⁶. Akal mentions that until the victory of the Sakarya war and Enver Pasha's trip to Bukhara, Trabzon did not accept the Ankara Government's authority. As well as Ankara and Erzurum, Trabzon is mentioned as an important political centre whose influence remained until 1923.

For Bünyamin Kocaoğlu's study *Mütakerede İttihatçılık*, the Unionism of the SDNR-T was extremely obvious⁴⁷. According to Kocaoğlu, the SDNR-T was the most important Society and the SDNR-T's formation and political activities were closely linked to Trabzon's strong Unionism. Kocaoğlu highlights the significant role of the political activities of the Greek and Armenians of Trabzon who alarmed the local Muslim elite. Greek and Armenian local gangs are described as local organizations, which violated the order. According to Kocaoğlu it was the Unionists of Trabzon who responded to the Political activities of Greek and Armenian political organizations. The Unionists responded because they were the most powerful political organization in Trabzon and they thought that the İstanbul government, which was opposed to the Union and Progress Party, should leave Trabzon alone. Kocaoğlu says that the local Muslim elite who formed SDNR-T and published *Istikbal* newspaper was entirely made up of Unionists⁴⁸. All of the most important local notables in Trabzon had relations with the Union and Progress Party.

The historian who gives a different interpretation, beyond the Unionism of the SDNR-T and the local Muslim elite of Trabzon is Stefanos Yerasimos. According to Yerasimos, the most important Societies that were formed in Anatolia were those in

⁴⁶ Akal 237-238.

⁴⁷ Kocaoğlu, Bünyamin, *Mütakerede İttihatçılık*, İstanbul: Temel Yayınları, 2006.

⁴⁸ Kocaoğlu 272.

Trabzon and Erzurum. Trabzon was Unionist, but furthermore, because Trabzon and Erzurum were the most significant trade centers in Anatolia, Greek and Armenian political activities were centered on them. Yerasimos writes that the local Muslim elite who responded to them and formed the SDNR-T came mainly from the local notable families. The SDNR-T was mainly formed by the Ulema (Islamic Scholars), senior tradesmen, senior landowners and intellectuals⁴⁹. And the intellectuals were generally the children of the local notables who were sent to Istanbul for education.

With the dominance of Unionism attributed to the SDNR-T and Istikbal Newspaper in a lot of studies, the Newspaper's ultimate publication policy could easily be defined as a Unionist one. Faik Ahmet Bey could also be defined as a leading Unionist figure in Trabzon during the National Struggle and the real sources of Faik Ahmet Bey's political thinking could thus be easily misunderstood. Moreover, even though the majority of the studies defined him as a Unionist, when we focus on his own memoirs Barutçu strongly rejects any Unionism⁵⁰. The Istikbal Newspaper did not even support Enver Pasha and his Bolshevik plans. In fact it acted against Enver Pasha. Faik Ahmet Bey wrote several articles against Enver Pasha and Bolshevism and the SDNR-T warned Trabzon public opinion against Enver Pasha's plans and Bolshevism⁵¹. Despite these realities, the Istikbal Newspaper is recorded by the Turkish historical writing as Unionist and a supporter of Enver Pasha.

Much space in the Turkish historical writing about the SDNR-T between 1919 and 1923 is also devoted to the Erzurum Congress and the SDNR-T's opposition to Mustafa Kemal Pasha. The issue of the opposition of the SDNR-T at the Erzurum congress is included in many different memoirs of the period. The Trabzon Society is, on the whole, perceived as disloyal to Mustafa Kemal Pasha and National Struggle in general. Together with its Unionism, its opposition to the Pasha added another minus point to Trabzon. The Erzurum Congress is seen by many historians as the main historical event which started the unity of the national struggle, and for this reason, Trabzon's opposition in the congress occupies a special place in historical literature.

⁴⁹ Yerasimos, Stefanos, *Az Gelişmişlik Sürecinde Türkiye*, 2 Vols, (İstanbul: Belge, 2005) 77.

⁵⁰ Barutçu, Faik Ahmet, *Siyasi Hatıralar*, 1 Vols, (İstanbul: 21. Yüzyıl Yayınları, 2001) 24-26.

⁵¹ Akbal, İsmail, "Milli Mücadele Kadrolarının Bolşevizme Yaklaşımı ve Trabzon'da Bolşevizm Karşısı İki Sima: Hafız Mehmet Bey ve Vali Hamit Bey", *Karadeniz Tarihi Sempozyumu* (Trabzon: KTÜ Yay, 25-26 Mayıs 2005) 954.

When we look at the most significant source of Turkish historical writing, Mustafa Kemal Pasha's *The Speech*, it is seen that the book also gives a lot of space to the Erzurum Congress. It is one of the main sources which condemned the SDNR-T as traitors. In *The Speech*, the formation of the Erzurum congress is described as an event which was organized by the Erzurum and Trabzon Society's will⁵². And it is stated that since Atatürk's trip to Amasya, both Societies sent telegrams to the Eastern provinces. Later on, the opposition to Mustafa Kemal at the Erzurum congress took place under the heading of "*Erzurum Kongresinde Görülen Kararsızlıklar*". According to *The Speech*, from the beginning of the conference Mustafa Kemal's participation was discussed by the participants. And later on during his election as the chairman of the congress, long discussions took place⁵³. According to Mustafa Kemal Pasha, one of the most important delegates who was opposed to his leadership was the Trabzon delegate Ömer Fevzi Bey. Ömer Lütfi Bey and his friends' opposition to Mustafa Kemal is portrayed as a bad and accursed position to take. According to *the Speech*, Trabzon delegate Ömer Lütfi Bey was an enemy secret agent.

Fahri Belen also continued *The Speech*'s tone of accusation. Belen mentions the formation of the Erzurum Congress as an action of the Erzurum and Trabzon Societies⁵⁴. And it is also mentioned that Mustafa Kemal was called to the congress by the Erzurum SDNR. Erzurum also admitted the Pasha to the preparation committee of the congress and later stated that Atatürk wanted to be the Chairman of congress. The 2nd degree participant of the congress – Trabzon -, who joined with 11 delegates, was opposed to the chairmanship of Mustafa Kemal Pasha. According to Belen, the delegate Sürmene Ömer Fevzi Bey was opposed to Mustafa Kemal because he had refused the chairmanship of a well-known commander. Fevzi Bey believed that if Mustafa Kemal was elected as chairman, foreign reaction could be negative. Belen defines the main views of the opposition delegates as the desire to continue the political authority of the Sultanate and to submit to the occupying enemies. And he mentions that after the end of the congress, the Trabzon delegate Ömer Fevzi Bey and the Giresun delegate İbrahim

⁵² Atatürk, Mustafa Kemal, *Nutuk*, (Ankara: Bizbize 2007) 35.

⁵³ Atatürk 35.

⁵⁴ Belen, Fahri, *Türk Kurtuluş Savaşı: askeri, siyasi ve sosyal yönleriyle*, (Ankara : Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 1983) 92.

Hamdi Bey continued their opposition to Mustafa Kemal and to the decisions taken in the congress. Giresun delegate Ömer Naci Bey also joined them and disseminated his opposing ideas. In his opinion, the opposition of the Trabzon delegates was reducing the value of the Erzurum Congress and inadvertently helping the enemies⁵⁵. Mustafa Kemal Pasha's adopting measures against them was no surprise. He mentions that commander of the 3rd division of Trabzon Halid Bey, and Osman Ağa in Giresun fell silent and left their cities.

Cevat Dursunoğlu also deals with the SDNR-T's opposition to Mustafa Kemal Pasha⁵⁶. Dursunoğlu regarded the opposition of Trabzon as an insignificant incident. According to him, opposition to Mustafa Kemal's chairmanship was nothing important. Dursunoğlu mentions that nobody ever opposed Mustafa Kemal Pasha during his election as chairman. He was welcomed and acknowledged by everybody at Erzurum. For Dursunoğlu, the only opposition to Trabzon came from a legal problem and had nothing to do with Mustafa Kemal Pasha. The Society for the Defence of National Rights made all attempts to gather the congress under the heading of *Vilayat-ı Şarkiyeyi Müdafaa-i Hukuku Milliye Cemiyeti*, without ever mentioning its centre in İstanbul. But the delegates from Trabzon were elected under the name of the SDNR-T. For this reason, the Trabzon delegates demanded that the congress not be connected with the centre in İstanbul and they threatened to leave the congress if their demands were not met. Later the solution to the problem was found: a telegram was sent to the centre demanding Mustafa Kemal Pasha to make a statement on recent events and exercise power on the centre's behalf. Dursunoğlu mentions that while waiting for the answer, Mustafa Kemal Pasha was elected as the chairman and the problem was solved⁵⁷. According to Dursunoğlu, opposition to Atatürk was an insignificant issue, which could be dealt with. He mentions that some writers deal with the issue, and mentions conflicts between Unionists and Accordists. But according to Dursunoğlu, no opposition occurred during the congress.

Just like Dursunoğlu, Sabahtin Selek, Ali Fuat Cebesoy and Rauf Orbay fail to write about the SDNR-T delegates' opposition in their memoirs/studies. According to

⁵⁵ Belen 95-105.

⁵⁶ Dursunoğlu, Cevat, *Milli Mücadelede Erzurum*, İstanbul : Kaynak Yayınları, 2000.

⁵⁷ Dursunoğlu 101-102.

Sabahattin Selek, Mustafa Kemal was easily elected as a delegate of the congress and elected as its chairman thanks to the tolerance of the Erzurum SDNR⁵⁸. Selek also mentions Mustafa Kemal's election to the representative committee, while Ali Fuat Cebesoy also deals with opposition the same way. In his memoirs he writes of Mustafa Kemal Pasha's easy election as the congress chairman⁵⁹. Rauf Orbay does not even mention an opposition in Trabzon in his memoirs⁶⁰.

One of the most detailed studies of the Erzurum Congress is that by Mahmut Golođlu⁶¹. Golođlu deeply analyses the Congress and gives a large amount of space to the SDNR-T. According to Golođlu, the opposition of the SDNR-T was an important part of the congress and heated debates took place at the congress as a result of this. In Golođlu's study it is mentioned that the Trabzon and Erzurum SDNRs formed the majority of the Erzurum Congress. And Trabzon elected 11 delegates for representation in the SDNR-T. And those were mainly chosen by SDNR-T chairman Barutçuzade Ahmet Efendi. They reached Erzurum on 10 July and, according to Golođlu, started to hold meetings and debate the chairmanship of the congress. Golođlu also names the Trabzon delegate Ömer Fevzi Bey as the main opponent to Mustafa Kemal, saying that Ömer Fevzi Bey opposed Mustafa Kemal Pasha because he was a commander in the army and Ömer Fevzi Bey wanted a civilian chairman. According to Golođlu, Ömer Fevzi Bey also stated that if a commander was elected as chairman, foreign response could be negative with foreigners criticizing the Turks for following one man. Golođlu defines Ömer Fevzi Bey as strongly against Mustafa Kemal's leadership, and writes that he demanded that a chairman be elected from among civilian delegates, broadcasting his views among all the delegates. Eventually, Mustafa Kemal Pasha became suspicious and called upon Kazım Karabekir Pasha to take the problem in hand. Kazım Karabekir Pasha secretly met with Trabzon delegates Zeki, Servet and İzzet Bey and agreed with them on Mustafa Kemal Pasha's chairmanship. Despite this agreement, Ömer Fevzi Bey

⁵⁸ Selek, *Anadolu İhtilali*, 281.

⁵⁹ Cebesoy, Ali Fuat, *Siyasi Hatıralar*. (İstanbul: Temel, 2007) 145.

⁶⁰ Orbay, Rauf, *Siyasi Hatıralar*. (İstanbul: Ögün, 2003) 327-332.

⁶¹ Golođlu, Mahmut, *Erzurum Kongresi*. (İstanbul: İş Bankası, 2008) 75.

declared his opposition during the elections, but Mustafa Kemal Pasha was elected in the end⁶². Goloğlu's study is the first study to deal with the incident in a realistic way.

Kazım Karabekir also discusses the conflict in *İstiklal Harbimiz*⁶³. According to Karabekir, the partnership between Mustafa Kemal Pasha and Rauf Bey caused great conflict and debate at the Congress. Eventually Mustafa Kemal Pasha's chairmanship of the Congress was rejected by the Trabzon delegates⁶⁴ who declared that with Mustafa Kemal Pasha and Rauf Bey the Congress would fail. In order to function, the Congress had to elect another chairman. Karabekir also added that he had solved the conflict and guaranteed Mustafa Kemal's chairmanship⁶⁵.

Along with Unionism, Trabzon's opposition to Mustafa Kemal Pasha at the Erzurum Congress was noted as another infidelity of Trabzon and SDNR-T. And it has also been recorded by official historical writing as treason with *The Speech*. Other studies continued *The Speech's* tradition and blessed Trabzon, or never mentioned its opposition. But the incident strengthened the negative image of Trabzon in Turkish historical writing. The SDNR-T is seen as problematical by historians. But other studies gave a much more important place to the incident. According to İsmail Akbal it was a major turning point in relations between Mustafa Kemal Pasha and the SDNR-T⁶⁶ after which their relations never improved. But the bulk of historical writing considers the incident as Trabzon's treason.

The murder of the Trabzon delegate Ali Şükrü Bey also is mentioned in great detail in historical studies about Trabzon. For the great majority of the Turkish historical writing Ali Şükrü Bey's murder was not unexpected. Trabzon had been in conflict with Mustafa Kemal Pasha for a long time, and this conflict would inevitably boil over at some time. The incident has been described as the peak of the conflict between Mustafa Kemal Pasha and Trabzon. His murder is rated as the one of the most important events which stretched Mustafa Kemal Pasha-Trabzon relations. On the other hand, the official view about the incident depended on the denial of the Mustafa Kemal Pasha's role in the incident. But in any case, the Ali Şükrü Bey murder greatly

⁶² Goloğlu 76-90.

⁶³ Karabekir, Kazım, *İstiklal Harbimiz*, 1 Vols, İstanbul: Emre, 1997.

⁶⁴ Karabekir 136.

⁶⁵ Karabekir 110.

⁶⁶ Akbal, İsmail, 1919-1923 Yılları Arasında Muhallif Kimliğiyle Trabzon, 264.

influenced the formation of the 'opponent Trabzon' image in Turkish historiography. With this event, the focus on Trabzon shifted from Unionism to the Second Group problem. The SDNRT-T, Istikbal Newspaper and Faik Ahmet Barutçu were also related to the incident in this way. Because Ali Şükrü Bey was writing articles on Istikbal Newspaper, his murder and how it was written in history is especially important. The common theme of Turkish historiography is clear; Trabzon was Unionist, supported Enver Pasha, opposed to Mustafa Kemal Pasha at the Erzurum Congress and continued its opposition through the Second Group.

A great denial of Mustafa Kemal Pasha's role in the incident came from Falih Rıfki Atay. In Falih Rıfki Atay's *Çankaya*, the tone of the criticism against Ali Şükrü Bey and the Second Group is severe. According to Atay, the Second Group and Ali Şükrü Bey were all conservatives and Islamic revivalists who wanted to restore the Ottoman political and social structure. Atay believed that the Islamist hodjas, including Ali Şükrü Bey and the Trabzon deputies, were in this Group. According to Atay the opposition raised its criticism during the Lausanne Conference, and Ali Şükrü Bey made a harsh speech to the Assembly, and had a dispute with Mustafa Kemal Pasha⁶⁷. It was the Lame Osman who planned the murder after that point, and Mustafa Kemal Pasha had no connection with the incident. Faik Ahmet Barutçu, however, blamed the Pasha for the incident and relations between Trabzon and Ankara deteriorated⁶⁸. So, for Atay, the blame for the rising tension after the incident should be placed with Faik Ahmet Bey, and Mustafa Kemal Pasha had no link to the murder or role in the incident. On the contrary, he demanded the arrest of Lame Osman who was eventually killed by Mustafa Kemal's guards. It was Faik Ahmet Barutçu who instigated the incident. He accused the Pasha in his articles in Istikbal Newspaper. Atay's view is continued by Ömer Sami Coşar word by word; the Pasha had no connection with the incident, it was Lame Osman who acted independently and unsanctioned by the Pasha⁶⁹. Damar Arıkoğlu in his memoirs defines Faik Ahmet Bey and Istikbal Newspaper in the same way. According to Arıkoğlu, Faik Ahmet Bey increased the tension and made a very accusatory speech about Mustafa Kemal Pasha's role in Ali Şükrü Bey's murder as well

⁶⁷ Atay, Falih Rıfki, *Çankaya*, (İstanbul: Pozitif Yayınları, 2004) 367.

⁶⁸ Atay 368.

⁶⁹ Coşar, Ömer Sami, *Osman Ağa: "Lame Osman": Mustafa Kemal'in muhafızı*, ([s.l.] : Harman, 1971) 75.

as writing harsh articles about the Pasha in *Istikbal*⁷⁰. But Arıkoğlu believed that the newspaper had gone too far in publishing this.

Rauf Orbay tells the story in the same way as Atay. According to him, the only suspect in the incident was Lame Osman. Ali Şükrü was a well-known opponent and this gripped Lame Osman. It was not a political killing, because Mustafa Kemal Pasha had demanded the arrest of the Lema Osman⁷¹. Rauf Orbay's explanation of the incident is repeated by Ali Fuat Cebesoy in his memoirs. It was Lame Osman acting alone, and Mustafa Kemal Pasha punished him⁷². Cebesoy also added that the SDNR-T began an open opposition to Mustafa Kemal Pasha after the incident. Mete Tunçay also defined the incident in the same way as Cebesoy. According to Tunçay, after the event the SDNR-T, Faik Ahmet Bey and *Istikbal* Newspaper showed their hostility and openly rejected Mustafa Kemal Pasha⁷³.

Islamist history-writing also attributes importance to Ali Şükrü Bey's death. It states that Ali Şükrü Bey was a reactionary Islamist deputy, and the great majority of the Islamists perceived Trabzon Delegate Ali Şükrü Bey as a martyr who was killed by Mustafa Kemal Pasha, and his death was glorified⁷⁴. One of the most important examples of the Islamist studies about Ali Şükrü Bey's murder is by Kadir Mısıroğlu: *Trabzon Meb'usu Şehid-i Muazzez Ali Şükrü Bey*⁷⁵. Mısıroğlu's study's Islamist accent is high. According to him, the opposition of the Second Group and Ali Şükrü Bey was highly religious. And he openly declares Ali Şükrü Bey as a religious martyr. For him it is obvious that Ali Şükrü Bey was a conservative and straight-laced Islamist. He was against any liberalisation of women and alcoholic drinks, always criticised government policies, and was always hostile to the government's boot-lickers. Mısıroğlu also mentions that from the beginning of the First Assembly, Ali Şükrü Bey was against Mustafa Kemal Pasha and he thought that the Pasha was planning to form a Republican Regime. Ali Şükrü Bey was a follower of the Sultanate and an Islamist regime and opposed him. Under the dictatorship of Pasha he was killed.

⁷⁰ Arıkoğlu, Damar, *Hatıralarım*, (İstanbul: Tan Matbaası, 1961) 324..

⁷¹ Orbay, Rauf, *Siyasi Hatıralar*, 339.

⁷² Cebesoy, Ali Fuat, *Siyasi Hatıralar*, 361.

⁷³ Tunçay, Mete, *Türkiye'de Cumhuriyeti'nde Tek Parti Yönetiminin Kurulması*, 45.

⁷⁴ Demirel, Ahmet, *Birinci Meclis'te Muhalefet-İkinci Grup*, (İstanbul: İletişim, 1995) 30.

⁷⁵ Mısıroğlu, Kadir, *Ali Şükrü Bey : Şehid-i Muazzez*, İstanbul : Sebil Yayınevi, 1995.

Samet Ağaoğlu is as sure as Kadir Mısıroğlu about the incident⁷⁶. According to him, starting from the National Struggle, Ali Şükrü Bey was an open supporter of the Sultanate and Caliphate who was always against any other state leader than the Caliph or Sultan. Ağaoğlu also added that Ali Şükrü Bey was also criticising the government's policies. The enquiries were opened by him always succeeded and he became a popular deputy among the Ministers. Ağaoğlu only mentions that he was killed by Lame Osman Ağa. He doesn't offer an explanation as to why.

İsmail Göldaş defines the incident in different way. According to Göldaş, Ali Şükrü Bey's murder was a part of a greater plan by the government to liquidate the Assembly, eliminate the opposition and make new elections. He also defines the Ali Şükrü Bey incident as a tool for holding new elections and creating a new Assembly without the Second Group⁷⁷. Ahmet Demirel also mentions the incident as a significant one. After quoting the debates in the Assembly, Demirel defines that together with other reasons, the Assembly decided to renew elections because of the negative situation which occurred after Ali Şükrü Bey's murder⁷⁸. Demirel also states that because the Second Group didn't take part in the 1923 elections as a Group and with the effect of the indirect suffrage electoral method, the elections caused the elimination of the Second Group and the deputies of the First Group, appointed by the center, were elected⁷⁹. Together with that Demirel gives examples of statements from various memoirs which mentioned the role of Mustafa Kemal Pasha during the modifying of the deputies⁸⁰.

Ali Şükrü Bey's murder was the last straw in the negative image of the SDNR-T, Faik Ahmet Bey and Istikbal Newspaper. And the incident created a necessity for many writers to protect Mustafa Kemal Pasha from the event. But it was also seen as a part of a larger struggle going on in the Assembly. In any case, the Ali Şükrü Bey incident was the most important factor in the negative image of Trabzon. And it is perceived as the peak of the conflict between Ankara and Trabzon.

⁷⁶ Ağaoğlu, Samet, Kuvayı Milliye Ruhu, (İstanbul: Kaynak, 1999) 219.

⁷⁷ Göldaş, İsmail, Takrir-i Sükûn görüşmeleri : 1923 Seçimleri, Atama Meclis, (İstanbul : Belge Yayınları, 1997) 10-81.

⁷⁸ Demirel, Ahmet, Birinci Meclis'te Muhalafet İkinci Grup, (İstanbul: İletişim, 1995) 511.

⁷⁹ Demirel, 571.

⁸⁰ Demirel, 571-583.

1.4. THE COMMON LEGACY OF THE STUDIES:

The legacy of the studies on Faik Ahmet Bey is Unionism, opposition to Mustafa Kemal Pasha at the Erzurum Congress and supporting of the Second Group⁸¹. Together with all these points of view, Faik Ahmet Bey could be seen as a very strict and harsh opposition figure between 1919 and 1923. And he could be described as a Unionist Newspaper man who joined the opposition to Mustafa Kemal Pasha at the Erzurum Congress and who eventually supported the Second Group. His publication policy and coming real opposition between 1923 and 1925 could be seen as a normal continuation, stemming from the years 1918-1923. From the general tone of the studies, it can easily be assumed that Faik Ahmet Bey, SDNR-T and Istikbal Newspaper were opponents of Mustafa Kemal Pasha from the very beginning of the National Struggle.

However, when Faik Ahmet Bey's articles in Istikbal's entire collection are researched deeply the whole scenario changes and Faik Ahmet Bey's policy of neutrality between the years of 1918-1923 can be understood. Even though he had connections with the Unionists of Trabzon, in his articles Faik Ahmet Bey laid no emphasis on Unionism or the revival of the Union and Progress Party. More than a figure of opposition, for the sake of the unity of the national struggle, Faik Ahmet Bey remained neutral to conflicts until the murder of Ali Şükrü Bey. For Faik Ahmet Bey, the success of the National Struggle was above the daily conflicts of politics. There was a goal, which had to be achieved, and it was beyond political contention. For that goal Faik Ahmet Bey kept his articles out of the political conflicts. That is not to say that he didn't show his disapproval of incidents. Faik Ahmet Bey openly criticised the murder of Trabzon Deputy Eyüpzade İzzet Bey, and the removal of the Governor Hamit Bey but any open support for Enver Pasha or for Unionism or any open support for the Second Group cannot be found on his articles between 1919 and 1923. Faik Ahmet Bey

⁸¹ Emel Akal also mentioned Faik Ahmet Bey as a supporter of Bolshevism because of his Unionism. However when we look at the Faik Ahmet Bey's articles he openly declares that he had seen no chance of Bolshevism on the country. On the article of "Red Danger" he warned the people that Socialism and Bolshevism were meaningless dreams because there was not a working class like in Turkey like the ones in Europe. (Coşar, Osman Ağa, 221).

stayed neutral in order not to exacerbate conflicts. His articles didn't support any political Group even during the strongest conflicts⁸².

After Ali Şükrü Bey's murder Faik Ahmet Bey did not mention the Second Group's name and he did not support the Group openly. His reaction was not a reaction to a Group's name, Ali Şükrü Bey was an *Istikbal* writer and, more than that, for Faik Ahmet Bey the existence of an opposition Group on the Assembly was a necessity for national politics. According to him, without any opposition no clean politics could occur⁸³. After the death he started to support the ideological package of the Second Group, which seemed closer to him. The Second Group supported the sovereignty of the people, the superiority of the Assembly, and freedom of speech and they were against personal tyranny. He couldn't support the Second Group because the Group was liquidated in a very short time during the 1923 elections. The Group disappeared. So what Faik Ahmet Bey followed wasn't the Second Group, but its ideological package. And after Ali Şükrü Bey's murder Faik Ahmet Bey openly criticised the emerging regime of Tyranny. For him, the new regime failed to capture the true essence of a republican regime and sovereignty of the people. It was a mock republic based on personal tyranny.

⁸² Even before the murder of Ali Şükrü Bey, during the strongest conflicts between the First and Second Group because of the Lausanne Congress Faik Ahmet asked the end of the conflicts for the sake of the national unity and quick resolution of the Congress. His articles about the incident could be found on the *Istikbal*'s issues between 507-877.

⁸³ *Istikbal*' s 914 (12 Mayıs 1338/1923) issue is the best example of Faik Ahmet Bey's support to the existence of an opposition Group. On the article Faik Ahmet Bey argued that without an opposition group, an Assembly couldn't be a real one.

CHAPTER 2. FAIK AHMET BARUTÇU IN THE YEARS 1918-1923:

2.1. OPPOSITION FIGURES AND FACTS:

Any opposition attempt in Turkish historical writing and in historical studies is generally defined as high treason. This included the Second Group, the Progressive Republican Party, and the Liberal Republican Party. Sometimes they were accused of being traitors, reactionaries, Islamic revivalists or followers of the Sultanate regime. But when we look at the historical facts, the whole story changes. The followers of the Second Group were in reality the followers of a Republican Regime with more liberties; or the founders of an opposition party, which was accused of being a group of Islamic Revivalists, were the founders of the national struggle movement. In order to defend an opposition figure from these accusations, we have to understand their whole biography and political life in a holistic way. To distance Faik Ahmet Bey from these quick **nicknames** (traitor, Islamic Revivalist, supporter of the Sultanate Regime, reactionary) we have to focus on his entire political life. To do this we should focus on his role during the formation of the National Struggle and his articles which supported the National Struggle Movement. Faik Ahmet Bey was a founding member of the SDNR-T, which was one of the earliest societies formed for the national struggle. The society started to follow a policy of national salvation for the country one year before Mustafa Kemal Pasha's passage to Samsun. And it was the society which requested the gathering of the Erzurum Congress. So, although later a figure of opposition, Faik Ahmet Bey was a leading figure in the formation of the national struggle movement. And with a newspaper formed by him and the Trabzon Society, he was also encouraging the people to revolt and support the national cause. The later opposition figures were not always traitors or reactionaries, many of them they were the ones who actually worked towards the formation of the National Struggle Movement. For this reason, during the formation of the Republican Regime they also wanted to join to the process and be closely involved in the decision making. Faik Ahmet Bey was a great example of those figures. In order to understand this, we have to focus on his political life before the formation of the Republican Regime.

2.2. BIOGRAPHY OF FAIK AHMET BARUTÇU:

Faik Ahmet Barutçu was one of the most important figures in Trabzon during the National Struggle era. He worked tirelessly for the formation of a national struggle movement in Trabzon and the whole of Anatolia. Faik Ahmet Bey (1894-1959) was born in the Çarşı neighbourhood of Trabzon. His father, Barutçuzade Hacı Ahmet, was a significant member of the Trabzon local elite. He was the founder of the Trabzon Society for the Defence of National Rights and also its first chairman. And he is considered a leading *Unionist* of Trabzon. After the declaration of the Second Constitutional Monarchy when the local elite divided into the *Unionists* and *Freedom and Accord Party* followers, the Barutçuzade family was on the Unionists side. And at the same time, Barutçuzade Hacı Ahmet Efendi was the regional agent of the Union and Progress's *Secret Organization (Teşkilat-ı Mahsusa)*⁸⁴. So, Faik Ahmet Bey's family had important connections with Unionism and Union and Progress Party. After graduating from the Rüştiye and the Idadi School in Trabzon, Faik Ahmet Bey registered to *Dar-ül Fünun* Law Faculty. But before his graduation he was recruited to serve in Army. He spent the wartime as a reserve officer in Trabzon and Samsun. After the signing of the Mondros Armistice (1918), Barutçu returned to his education in İstanbul. But two months later he decided to go back to Trabzon in order to help to the organization of the national struggle movement⁸⁵.

During the National Struggle days Barutçu became well known as a writer, a public orator and a journalist. During those days Faik Ahmet Bey helped to form the *Society For The Defence Of The National Rights Of Trabzon*⁸⁶. SDNR-T was founded as a society to fight against the Greek and Armenian Political demands, the formation of a Pontus Kingdom and a Greater Armenina. After its formation, Barutçu became a

⁸⁴ Çapa, Mesut, *Milli Mücadele Döneminde Trabzon Müdafaa-i Hukuk Cemiyeti*, (Trabzon: Trabzon Belediyesi, 1998) 11.

⁸⁵ Akbulut, Ömer, *Trabzon Meşhurları Bibliyografyası : Edebiyatta, Sanatta, İlimde, Politikada ve her sahada yetişmiş Trabzonluların Hayatı ve Eserleri*, (Ankara : TTO, SO ve TBB Matbaası, 1970) 37.

⁸⁶ Barutçu, Siyasi Hatıralar, 34.

member of the Society. And he also became a member of the administrative council of the Trabzon *Türk Ocağı* in 1919⁸⁷

Faik Ahmet Bey also started to publish a newspaper in Trabzon. It was named the *Istikbal Newspaper*, he became the editor⁸⁸, and its first issue was published on 11 January 1918. Between 1918 and 1923 Faik Ahmet Bey wrote supportive articles on the National Struggle on the Newspaper. It was mainly a newspaper, which announced the views of the SDNR-T to the public and whose main aim was to enlighten the people while creating awareness of the national struggle. To achieve this goal, Barutçu wrote many articles on the title page of the newspaper. Briefly, his articles included the issues of Greek political organizations in Trabzon and the Black Sea area, the general problems of the national struggle and foreign policy. Through my own research on the collection I observed the following: it is clear that, until early 1923, *Istikbal Newspaper* and Faik Ahmet Bey's articles dealt with the above topics.

After the murder of Ali Şükrü Bey, Faik Ahmet Bey's tone in his articles started to change. With Ali Şükrü Bey's death, the closing down of the SDNR-T and the formation of the People's Party, Faik Ahmet Bey started to become alienated from the emerging regime and eventually turned out to be an opposition figure. Between 1923 and 1925 he wrote articles, which included severe criticisms of the new regime. The main components of those articles were his ideas about the sovereignty of the people; freedom of the press, people's self-rule (decentralisation), liberalism and a truly democratic republic depending on a multi-party regime. Those were the ideas mainly supported by the Second Group of the First Assembly, and Faik Ahmet Bey's ideological leaning became closer to the ideas of the Second Group. Faik Ahmet Bey also joined the formation of the Trabzon branch of *Progressive Republican Party*. He became the secretary of the Party for several months during its existence but the life of the Party came rapidly to an end. Faik Ahmet Bey became a harsh opponent, and the Single Party regime consequently closed down *Istikbal Newspaper* with the Maintenance of Order Law in 1925. When *Istikbal Newspaper* closed down in 1925,

⁸⁷ Mesut Çapa, *Faik Ahmet Barutçu Hayatı ve Kişiliği*, (Trabzon: T .C. Trabzon Valiliği İl Kültür Müdürlüğü 1998) 13.

⁸⁸ The Newspaper named from the Ali Şefkati's shortly published Newspaper of *Istikbal*. Ali Şefkati's newspaper decided to be the official publication organ of the Union and Progress Party but it was published in a very short time. (Barutçu, Faik Ahmet, *Siyasi Hatıralar*, 34).

Faik Ahmet Bey started to work as an advocate. And between the periods of 1933-1934 and 1938-39, Barutçu was elected as the Chairman of the Bar of Trabzon⁸⁹. In the 1939 elections Barutçu was elected as the 6th term Trabzon deputy from the Republican People's Party. And he continued his deputyship in the 7th, 8th and 9th terms of the National Assembly. Faik Ahmet Barutçu became the Vice President and Minister of State in the Hasan Saka Cabinet. He could not be reelected as a Trabzon deputy in the 1954 elections, and in 1957 he was elected as the deputy of Trabzon again. In 1959 Faik Ahmet Barutçu died in Ankara⁹⁰.

2.2.1. FORMATION OF THE SOCIETY FOR THE DEFENCE OF THE NATIONAL RIGHTS OF TRABZON:

The Ottoman political elite and the Ottoman army perceived the defeat of the Ottoman Empire in WWI as a serious threat to its existence. It was generally seen as the end of the road. Following defeat in the Great War, there were different responses to the loss of territory in the Ottoman Empire. The most important response came from the army officials, local elites and *Union and Progress Party* members (local members and the local party centre). Those groups wanted to organize a resistance movement in Ottoman Anatolia. According to Zürcher, the Union and Progress Party was one of the earliest political organizations which understood the possible consequences of the defeat in the summer of 1918 and started to prepare a resistance movement. The followers of the repealed Union and Progress Party started to form different organizations and societies whose aim was to organize a resistance movement⁹¹. According to Macfie, those societies were the *Trakya-Pashaeli Müdafaa-i Heyet-i Osmaniyesi*, *Vilayat-ı Şarkiyeye Müdafaa Hukuk-ı Milliye*, *İzmir Müdafaa-i Hukuk-u Osmaniye*, and *Trabzon Muhafaza-i Hukuk Sociyet*⁹². Preparations for a resistance movement also started in Trabzon. Along with Erzurum, Trabzon was one of the earliest

⁸⁹ Bal, Mehmet Akif, *Hatıralarda Trabzon'un Yakın Tarihi*, (Trabzon: abp Yayınevi, 2004) 238.

⁹⁰ Barutçu spent his last years on the Republican People's Party. On the 31 October 1958 he was elected as the Vice President of the Assembly Group of the Party. It was İsmet İnönü who asked him to join to the Party after the death of Mustafa Kemal Pasha. He joined to the opening of the new Assembly on 1 November 1958, but Barutçu died during early 1959.

⁹¹ Zürcher, Erik Jan, *The Unionist Factor* 109-160.

⁹² Macfie, A.L. *The End of the Ottoman Empire, 1908-1923*, (New York: Longman, 1998) 186.

cities to organize a resistance movement. And within a few years Trabzon became a leading city in the resistance movement together with Erzurum and Ankara.

When we look at the formation of the SDNR-T, the Unionist contribution thesis of Zürcher corrects itself. The SDNR-T was a society which was formed by the efforts of the local Unionist elites of Trabzon. The main group, which formed the SDNR-T, was the former Unionists⁹³. The idea of forming a society for the resistance movement came from the former Unionist secret service *Secret Organization (Teşkilat-ı Mahsusa)*'s Trabzon local agent Barutçuzade Hacı Ahmet Efendi⁹⁴. Hacı Ahmet Efendi sent a secret letter to the all sandjaks, and county mayors of Trabzon and demanded that they send three representative delegates. Odabaşoğlu also states that the majority of the delegates who came from sandjaks and counties were former Unionists.

When we look at the historical background of the formation of SDNR-T, the main reason behind the formation of the Society was the increasing demands of the Greek and Armenian political organizations. More than to the Armenian demands, SDNR-T was mainly a response to the Greek nationalism in the region. The Greek local notables, politicians, religious leaders and gangs who wanted to form a Greek/Pontus Kingdom in the territory, mainly followed the Greek nationalism. And the greatest reaction to this nationalism came from the local Turkish/Muslim elite, which was mainly made up of former Unionists. This elite came together in order to prevent the Greek and Armenian demands and decided to form a society. It was a society to defend the rights of the Turk/Muslim community against the Greek and Armenian demands⁹⁵. Faik Ahmet Barutçu gives the same view. According to his own memoirs, the very beginning of the formation of the SDNR-T was an answer to the rising Greek political activities after the declaration of the armistice in 1918⁹⁶. He argues that local notables in Anatolia understood that Istanbul couldn't organize a resistance movement, and it was their duty to organize it themselves. According to Barutçu, the Allies had promised Eastern Anatolia to the Armenians and the Black Sea to the Greeks, and local elite in

⁹³ Zürcher, Erik Jan, *The Unionist Factor*, 142.

⁹⁴ Odabaşoğlu, Cumhuriyet, *Belgelerle Milli Mücadele yılları 1919-1923*, (Trabzon: C.Odabaşoğlu, 1990) 62-63.

⁹⁵ Sakallı, Bayram, *Milli Mücadelenin Sosyal Tarihi*, (İstanbul: İz, 1997) 177.

⁹⁶ Barutçu, Faik Ahmet Siyasi Hatıralar, 26.

Trabzon was aware of this reality⁹⁷. Çapa also says that after the Paris Conference (1919), which was held after the declaration of the armistice, Trabzon became the centre of the Greeks' and Armenians' demands⁹⁸. He adds that the Greek local notables in Trabzon started intensive diplomatic and propaganda activity⁹⁹.

The Greek Political Societies in Istanbul, Trabzon and Batumi followed the Pontus Greek Kingdom ideal. Çapa defines 4 Greek Societies actively working for the formation of the Greek Pontus Kingdom; a) *Rum Göçmenler Cemiyeti* (İstanbul), b) *Küçük Asya Cemiyeti* (1919-İstanbul), c) *Meşru Müdafaa Cemiyeti* (1908 Black Sea Region), and d) *Batumi Pontus Cemiyeti* (1919 Batumi)¹⁰⁰. The common point of all these societies was to organize the Christian community of the region for the formation of a Greek Kingdom. People like Greek businessman K.Kostantinides also held a Pontus conference in French Marseilles on 4 February 1918 to bring American and European Greeks together. Black Sea local notables and Christian religious leaders were also helping the Pontus ideal. The Metropolitan of Trabzon Hristanos was an active figure of Greek Nationalism. Hristanos traveled to Paris and London in order to defend the Pontus ideals and gain the support of European public opinion for the formation of a Pontus Kingdom¹⁰¹. Hristanos also attended the Paris Conference on 2 May 1919 and submitted a communique named *La Question du Pont-Euxin* and declared that an autonomous Pontus state, which included Trabzon and Black Sea area, had to be instituted under the direction of a powerful state¹⁰².

At the beginning of 1918, the key Turkish/Muslim local notables of Trabzon, who believed in forming a struggle movement, started to gather in meetings among themselves¹⁰³. This was a response to the call of Barutçuzade Hacı Ahmet. And with the attendance of 300 members, *Trabzon Muhafaza-i Hukuk-u Milliye Society* was formed at the Nemlizades mansion in Trabzon. The Society was formed on 12 February 1919

⁹⁷ Barutçu 25-26.

⁹⁸ Çapa, Mesut, *Milli Mücadele döneminde Trabzon*, 9.

⁹⁹ Çapa, Mesut, *Pontus Meselesi*, (Trabzon: Serander, 2001) 97.

¹⁰⁰ Çapa 52-56.

¹⁰¹ Okur, Mehmet, "Milli Mücadele Döneminde Fener Rum Patrikhanesi'nin ve Metropolitlerin Pontus Rum Devleti Kurulmasına Yönelik Girişimleri", *Atatürk Yolu* 29 (2002), 9.

¹⁰² Goloğlu, Mahmut, *Erzurum Kongresi*, 35.

¹⁰³ Goloğlu, Mahmut, *Milli Mücadelede Trabzon ve Mustafa Kemal Pasha*, 15.

¹⁰⁴. The temporary members of the central comission of the society were: Temelzade Sabri Bey, Barutçuzade Hacı Ahmet, Eyübzade İzzet Bey, Eyübzade Ömer Fevzi Bey, Abanozzade Hüseyin Avni Efendi, Murathanzade Ziya Bey, Nemlizade Sabri, Hatipzade Emin, Gazazzade Hüseyin Efendi, Hacıalihafızzade Mehmet Salih, Mollabekirzade Mehmet Ali, Müftüzade Mehmet¹⁰⁵. Hafız Mehmet, Barutçuzade Faik Ahmet, Çulhazade Hacı Kadri, Nemlizade Şevki, Subaşızade Münir, Zehirzade Zühdü, Hocazade İbrahim Cudi, Kulaksızzade İbrahim, Ustazade Nazmi were elected to the administrative council of the Society¹⁰⁶. Barutçuzade Hacı Ahmed Efendi¹⁰⁷ was elected as the head of the society.

After the formation of the society, the local branches of the society in Rize, Gümüşhane, Giresun and Ordu immediately opened. The society then decided to hold a regional congress in Trabzon and send telegrams to the provincial subdivisions. The first Trabzon Regional Congress was held on 23 February 1919¹⁰⁸. Central and local members of the society and Trabzon Governor Necmi Bey joined the congress which was held in the house of the Nemlizades. The Mufti of Trabzon, İmadeddin Efendi, was elected to the chairmanship, Gümüşhane delegate Zeki Kadirbeyoğlu was elected as the second chairman and Faik Ahmet Barutçu as the executive vice president¹⁰⁹. At the first congress it was decided to send a committee to Paris. This could be a committee with five people and their main aim was defined as to explain the general circumstances of the Trabzon province's population and geography and to prove that the Greek and

¹⁰⁴ Except Sabahattin Özel and Bayram Sakallı many sources gives th date 12 February 1919. According to Özel (1991, 62) the date is 10 February 1919, and Sakallı also gives the same date (Sakallı, 176). Emel Akal defines 12 February 1919 (2006, 236). Goloğlu also defies 12 February 1919 as the date of the first meeting of the Society (1981, 16). Zurcher (1984, 143) also gives the date 12 February 1919. Faik Ahmet Barutçu doesn't give the exact date in his memoirs.

¹⁰⁵(Barutçuoğlu, 46), (Çapa, 1998, 10-11), (Goloğlu,1981, 15-16), (Çapa, 2001, 97), (Özel, 1991, 63).

¹⁰⁶ Trabzon SDNR mainly consisted of the local intellectuals, members of the landed notables and rich classes, officers and local merchants of Trabzon province. Society's chairman Barutçuzade Ahmet Efendi was a member of the local notables, Hafız Mehmed and Eyübzade İzzet were the Trabzon deputies of the Ottoman Assembly of Delegates and later Trabzon deputies of the First National Assembly, Abanozzade Hüseyin was from the local notables (Goloğlu, 18-19). Nemlizade Sabri was the Trabzon Deputy of the First National Assembly (Demirel, 1995, 103). Eyüpzade Ömer Fevzi was a advocate (Goloğlu, 1981, 16). And Eyüboğlu İzzet was from the local notables of Trabzon and Deputy of the Trabzon on the First National Assembly (Demirel, 1995, 103). Çulhazade Hacızade was a leading merchant of Trabzon (Goloğlu, 1981, 16). Münir Subaşı was the head of the Turk Ocağı of Trabzon (Goloğlu, 1981, 16).

¹⁰⁷ Barutçuzade Hacı Ahmet Bey was a significant member of the local notables of Trabzon. He had close relations with the Union and Progress Party, and he was the Trabzon chief of the Unionist Secret Organization (Goloğlu, 1981, 16). He was a leading former-Unionst figure of Trabzon.

¹⁰⁸ Çapa, Milli Mücadele döneminde Trabzon Müdafaa-i Hukuk Cemiyeti, 51.

¹⁰⁹ Çapa 11.

Armenian population was not a majority over the Turks. Because the committee had to explain the real situation at the Paris Peace Conference, it was decided to elect the members of the committee from former ambassadors who had the sympathy of the Allies. The committee was expected obtain the support of the Allies and to publish positive articles about the Turkish resistance movement. At last the Gümüşhane delegate Zeki Kadirbeyoğlu, Hatibzade Emin Efendi, the Ordu delegate İsmail Bey, Ömer Fevzi Efendi and the Rize delegate Mustafa Efendi were elected to the committee¹¹⁰. At the same time, the financial affairs of the society and its local branches were organised. It was also decided to expand the society into the rural areas of the Trabzon region. After the Congress, members of the society continued to open up local branches, and the Rize and Giresun branches opened¹¹¹.

After the first congress, the members of the society decided to hold a second congress. According to Goloğlu¹¹², one of the most important reasons for the formation of the Second Trabzon congress was the Armenian memorandum that was given at the Paris peace conference in 26 February 1919. The memorandum included the Armenian claims to Maraş, Kilikya, Eastern Provinces and Trabzon. Within that period the Greek forces also occupied İzmir. The congress of Trabzon was held after the occupation of İzmir on 28 May 1919¹¹³. This occupation led to important and lengthy discussion between delegates.

Servet and İzzet Bey were elected as congress chairmen. The most important proposal came from Zeki Kadirbeyoğlu and the Rize delegate Osman Nuri Bey. Zeki Bey and Osman Nuri Bey called for a common congress of the Vilayat-ı Sitte (Erzurum, Van, Elazığ, Diyarbakir, Bitlis, Sivas) in Erzurum. It was eventually accepted by all the delegates and telegrams were sent to the Erzurum Vilayat-ı Şarkiyye Müdafaa-i Hukuk-ı Milliye Society, Van, Diyarbakir, Bitlis, Elazığ (Mamüretülaziz), Sivas Müdafaa-i Hukuk-ı Milliye societies¹¹⁴. At the same time, Erzurum also made a similar appeal.

¹¹⁰ Hatibzade Emin Efendi was a former Mufti and Delegate of the Second Constitution Assembly of Delegates, Ömer Fevzi Efendi was an advocate. (Goloğlu, 1981, 15-16). Zeki Kadirbeyoğlu was from a local notable family of Gümüşhane and he was a merchant and later deputy of Gümüşhane on the Second National Assembly. He also joined to the formation of the Progressive Republican Party. (Lermioğlu, 11-15).

¹¹¹ Goloğlu, Erzurum Kongresi, 20.

¹¹² Goloğlu, Erzurum Kongresi, 21.

¹¹³ Çapa, Milli Mücadele döneminde Trabzon Müdafaa-i Hukuk Cemiyeti, 51.

¹¹⁴ Mısıroğlu, Kadir, Ali Şükrü Bey, 153.

Erzurum Vilayat-ı Şarkıyye Müdafaa-i Hukuk-ı Milliye Society gladly answered Trabzon's call and declared the unity of object, destiny and efforts between Erzurum and Trabzon and started to prepare for the congress. When the second congress of Trabzon ended, both the Trabzon and Erzurum societies started to arrange the Erzurum Congress of 23 July 1919, which 17 Trabzon delegates attended¹¹⁵.

During the preparations for the First Trabzon Congress, Mustafa Kemal Pasha also sent two telegrams in order to join as a delegate. The first telegram met with no response from Trabzon and his second telegram received a negative reply. Trabzon delegates were not well informed about the Pasha and didn't want him to attend the Congress. According to Zeki Kadirbeyoğlu's memoirs, Trabzon rejected him because they demanded the formation of a movement consisting of the people. If Pasha should join in his military capacity he would use his power in a dictatorial way¹¹⁶. Under these circumstances, Pasha did not join the Congress and this constituted the first crisis between him and the Trabzon SDNR.

2.2.2. SOCIETY FOR THE DEFENCE OF THE NATIONAL RIGHTS OF TRABZON BETWEEN 1920 AND 1923:

Between 1920 and 1923 three important events relating to the SDNR-T can be mentioned: the SDNR-T's relations with the National Assembly, the SDNR-T and Enver Pasha relations and the SDNR-T's opposition to the *People's Party*. The SDNR-T was an organization which worked for the formation of the national struggle movement in Anatolia. Between 1920 and 1923 the SDNR-T worked for the formation of a central resistance movement. For the society, this could be achieved in the National Assembly. The National Assembly was the place where the centralization of the national resistance movement could be formed. To achieve this, after the closing down of the Ottoman Chamber of Deputies, the SDNR-Ts led the elections of the National Assembly of Ankara in Trabzon. On 12 April 1920 elections were held in Trabzon and

¹¹⁵ Çapa, Mesut, Milli Mücadele Döneminde Trabzon, 14.

¹¹⁶ Lermioğlu, Ömer Faruk, Kadirbeyoğlu Zeki Bey'in Hatıraları, (İstanbul: Sebil, 2007) 48.

Kapancızade Hamit Bey, Eyubzade İzzet Bey, Nemlizade Sabri, Alaybeyzade Faik Bey and Fazlızade Recai Bey were elected as deputies¹¹⁷. But within the death of Eyubzade İzzet Bey and the illness of Nemlizade Sabri Bey, a re-election was held in October 1920 and Hafız Mehmet Bey, Hacı Ali Hafızzade Celaleddin (Aykar Efendi), Hasan (Saka), Nebizade Hamdi (Ülkümen) were elected as the deputies and sent to the assembly in January 1921. Eventually, seven deputies from Trabzon were sent to the First National Assembly, including Ali Şükrü Bey, Hüsrev Gerede, Recai Baykal, Hasan Saka, Hafız Mehmet Engin, Hamdi Ülkümen and Celaleddi Aykar¹¹⁸. After the opening of the Assembly some changes occurred in the organization of the Defence of the National Rights. Mustafa Kemal Pasha demanded the formation of a political group united under a single programme and on 10 May 1921, *Society for the Defence of the National Rights of Anatolia and Rumelia Group* was formed. According to Çapa (1998, 18) the group's formation was welcomed by the SDNR-T. Çapa mentions that Trabzon saw the Group as a "regulating factor" among the different groups on the assembly. With the formation of the Group, the Societies started to be represented in the assembly as a political group.

One of the other important events involving the SDNR-T between 1920 and 1923 is the SDNR-T's relation with the Unionists. In Berlin, Enver Pasha created an organization under the name *İslam İhtilal Cemiyetleri Şuraları* (Union of Islamic Revolutionary Societies). He then created a Turkish Branch of this organization, the Halk Şuralar Fırkası (People's Soviet Party). To follow the events in Anatolia and to connect with SDNR-T, Enver Pasha came to Batumi on 30 July 1921¹¹⁹. Enver Pasha stayed for three months with the support of Yahya Kahya and his militia. Unionist

¹¹⁷ Except Kapancızade Hamit Bey, so less is known about the rest of the figures. Hamit Bey was an important figure of Ottoman Bureaucracy, who actively joined to the National Struggle Movement. He had been on the duties of Governor of Trabzon, Erzurum and Adana. In each of the city he has joined to the national struggle (Eken, 2008, 560-648). During his governorship of Trabzon, he has joined to the Trabzon Society for the Defence of the National Rights. Eyübzade İzzet was the Trabzon deputy of the Ottoman Assembly of Delegates and later Trabzon deputy of the First National Assembly. (Goloğlu, 1981, 18-19). Alaybeyzade Faik Bey was a judge, Fazlızade Recai Baykal was an army officer (Goloğlu, , 1981, 37).

¹¹⁸ Hamdi Ülkümen was a teacher and journalist and Celaleddin Aykar was a merchant (Goloğlu, 1981, 38). Ali Şükrü Bey was the famous deputy of Trabzon who was killed by Lame Osman later. He was also the deputy of Trabzon of the Istanbul Assembly (Mısıroğlu, 15-40). Hüsrev Gerede was the soldier, politician and diplomat of close history. He was also a close friend of Mustafa Kemal Pasha (Önal, 2002, 5-10). Hasan Saka was a deputy of the Ottoman Assembly of Delegates. And he was elected as the deputy of the Trabzon again He was going to the an important figure before the formation of the Democratic Party. (Goloğlu, 1981, 38).

¹¹⁹Zürcher, The Unionist Factor, 128.

Küçük Talat, who was in Trabzon, was in contact with the Enver Pasha and he demanded that the Pasha win the support of the former Unionists in Trabzon. Both Küçük Talat and Yahya Kahya were members of the SDNR-T. When Enver Pasha's demand to pass to Anatolia from Trabzon was understood by Mustafa Kemal Pasha, the former Unionists in Trabzon were banished. Küçük Talat was exiled to İstanbul, and Halil Pasha was forcibly exiled from the country. To prevent Enver Pasha's passage to Trabzon and stop his supporters, Kazım Karabekir replaced division commander Seyfi (Düzgören) Bey with colonel Sami Sabit (Karaman). Sami Sabit Bey's actions were heavily criticized in *Istikbal*. *Istikbal* denied the SDNR-T's support for Enver Pasha. According to *Istikbal*, the SDNR-T had no relations with Enver Pasha¹²⁰. And according to Faik Ahmet Bey, the SDNR-T did not have any close relations with Küçük Talat and Halil Pasha. After these events the SDNR-T's central committee resigned en masse and new elections were held.

The SDNR-T was also opposed to the transformation of the Defence of the National Rights Societies to the People's Party. When the 9 Points of the New Party were sent to Trabzon, the SDNR-T strongly rejected the programme. According to Tunçay (2005, 45), a leading opponent group, led by the former Governor of Trabzon Hamit Bey, mayor Gazazzade Hüseyin Efendi, SDNR-T chairman Barutçuzade Ahmet Bey and Faik Ahmet Bey, were agitating against Ankara because of the assassination of Ali Şükrü Bey by Lame Osman Ağa. Under these conditions, the SDNR-T opposed the transfer of *Society for the Defence of the National Rights of Anatolia and Rumelia Group* to the People's Party. The SDNR-T announced that this transformation was against the Charter of the society, and stated its opposition with a declaration form. An investigation committee consisting of two deputies was then sent to Trabzon from Ankara, and the SDNR-T representative committee was abolished and a new one was formed¹²¹.

¹²⁰ *Istikbal*, 22 April 1922: 595.

¹²¹ Mete Tunçay, *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nde Tek Parti Yönetimi'nin kurulması 1923-1931*. İstanbul, 2005, 45.

2.2.3. FAIK AHMET BARUTÇU AND THE FORMATION OF ISTIKBAL NEWSPAPER

After WWI Russian forces occupied the city of Trabzon. One of the most important effects of the occupation was on the Turkish newspapers. Many Turkish/Muslim newspapers closed down and their printing houses were damaged by Russian forces but Greek newspapers like *Epohi*, and *Faros Anatolis* continued their publications¹²². The Russians even started to print their own newspapers and the Turkish/Muslim elite demanded a newspaper which could support their ideals. This newspaper would be Istikbal.

Within these conditions, from 1918 the former Turkish/Muslim elite of the city started to gather at meetings in order to publish a newspaper. These meetings were held before the formation of the SDNR-T and were the first steps of the national resistance in Trabzon. The founders of the SDNR-T and Istikbal Newspaper were mainly drawn from the same local elite group. The major meeting started on the night of 30 October 1918, and Barutçuzade Hacı Ahmed (later chairman of SDNR-T), his son Faik Ahmet Barutçu, his son in law Zeyne'l abidin, Union and Progress provincial administration member Hafız Mahmud and Halim, Trabzon Sultani high school administrator Rıfkı, literature instructor Mahmud Murad, Sultani primary part administrator Murad Hulusi and Hacı Ali Hafizoğulları were all in attendance. The main aim of their meeting was to publish a newspaper which could support the national struggle ideal and they wanted to introduce this to the people. For them the newspaper would be a tool for enlightening the people about the plans of the Allies which could divide the country and demolish the state. At the end of the night, Faik Ahmet, Zeyne'l-abidin, Mustafa Reşit Tarakçıoğlu, and Mahmud Murad Bey decided to publish a political newspaper in order to promote the national struggle among the people.

¹²² Albayrak, Hüseyin, Trabzon Basın Tarihi, (Ankara: TDVY, 1994) 101.

Two days after the meeting, Faik Ahmet Barutçu, Advocate Salih, Zeki Bey and Mustafa Mustafa Reşit Tarakçıoğlu met again at Zeyne'l-abidin Bey's house¹²³. All the participants agreed on the idea of printing a newspaper and Faik Ahmet Barutçu was charged with the task. The newspaper was to be a political and a scientific newspaper, and the division of labour was decided upon. Political and social articles were shared between Zeyne'l-abidin, Mahmud Murat Bey and Mustafa Reşid Tarakçıoğlu, Salih Zeki Bey¹²⁴ was charged with writing political articles under the heading of *Adrese-i Eyyam* (Mirror of the Days), and Faik Ahmed Barutçu was assigned the leading articles and decisions regarding the political aspect of the newspaper. Members of the local elite of Trabzon Nüzhet Haşim, Salih Zeki, Ustazade Nazmi, Ebul Nimet and Ali Şükrü Bey also contributed to the Newspaper with their articles.

Under these conditions, Istikbal newspaper began to be printed by Faik Ahmet Barutçu in Trabzon after the chaotic days of the Mondros Treaty. Starting from the 10 December 1918 the newspaper was printed for seven years and the last 1426th copy of the newspaper was printed on 17 March 1925¹²⁵. Under the Maintenance of Order Law (Takrir-i Sükun), the government closed down the newspaper on account of its opponent attitude¹²⁶. Because of the lack of Turkish printing houses, the newspaper was mainly published at the Greek *Yorgi Mihailidi* printing house. 300 copies in 2/1 margins of the first issue of Istikbal were printed¹²⁷. Throughout its publication, casting of the page and publication days changed from time to time: from 6 April 1920, “*For the present time the newspaper is published twice a week on Saturday and Tuesday*” was expressed on the front page. From 12 May 1920, Istikbal started to be published on Sunday and Wednesday and from 12 January 1920 it changed to Monday and Thursday. After the second İnönü war, the newspaper started to print 500 copies. And, due to

¹²³ Albayrak, Hüseyin, “Millî Mücadelede Trabzon Basını ve İstikbâl Gazetesi”, Trabzon Tarihi İlmî Toplantısı : 6-8 Kasım 1998, bildiriler, (Trabzon Türk Ocağı, Trabzon Belediyesi, Trabzon Valiliği,2000) 564.

¹²⁴ Zeynel'abidin was the son-in-law of SDNR-T's leader Barutçuzade Hacı Ahmet, Mahmud Murat Bey was a teacher of Litterature, Salih Zeki Bey was an advocate, Zeki Tarakçıoğlu was the administrator of the school of teachers (Albayrak, 1994, 101-102).

¹²⁵ The entire collection of the Newspaper is in the Faik Ahmet Barutçu Library of the K.T.Ü on Trabzon. During this study copies of that collection used in and translated. With a few missing articles, K.T.Ü owns the whole collection. The translation of the articles inside the thesis belongs to me.

¹²⁶ Goloğlu, Mahmut, Devrimler ve Tepkileri 1924-1930, (İstanbul: T.İşbankası Kültür Yayınları, 2008)136.

¹²⁷ Albayrak, Hüseyin, Trabzon Basın Tarihi, 104.

rising demand, *Istikbal* became a daily newspaper after 27 January 1920¹²⁸ and this statement was added to the heading: “*Except Saturday, the Newspaper is published everyday of the week. The Newspaper is political and scientific, it consists of freethinking and depends on Turkishness*”.

News was mainly supplied by other newspapers and newsagents. The Turkish press and especially the İstanbul and Ankara newspapers were followed to obtain news. *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* and *Yenigün* of Ankara, and local Anatolian newspapers were also used as news sources. Greek, English, and French newspapers were read for European news; and *İslam Gürcistanı* and the official Georgian newspaper *Barba* were also followed for announcements¹²⁹. Starting from the 1920s, the main source of news was the Anadolu Agent, which was formed by Mustafa Kemal Pasha.

2.2.4. İSTIKBAL NEWSPAPER AND FAİK AHMET BEY’S MAIN VIEWS, 1918-1923:

Through my own research of the entire collection of *Istikbal* Newspaper, I have observed that the literary life of *Istikbal* newspaper and Faik Ahmet Bey before the declaration of the Republican Regime should be divided into two eras: 1918-1920 and 1920-1923. The first era concerned local problems in Trabzon and formation of a national resistance in the city. *Istikbal* started up in order to help the formation of a national resistance in Trabzon. And from the beginning its ultimate aim was the organization of this movement. *Istikbal* was an agitative newspaper. Faik Ahmet Bey wrote incendiary articles in *Istikbal* in order to awaken people and to form a national resistance society in Trabzon. Between 1919 and 1920, the newspaper’s main aim was the formation of a national resistance and Faik Ahmet Bey’s articles in the newspaper were about the local problems of Trabzon. According to Faik Ahmet Bey the main problem was the lack of a central society to defend Turkish rights. Trabzon’s ultimate aim should be the formation of a Society for the Defence of National Rights in Trabzon. The Entente states wanted to give Anatolia to the Greeks and Armenians so the Turks of

¹²⁸ Çapa gives the date 27 January 1921, but Albayrak’s date is the true one (Albayrak, 1994, 194).

¹²⁹ Çapa, Mesut, “Milli Mücadele Döneminde *Istikbal* Gazetesi”, *Atatürk Yolu* 9, (Ankara Üniversitesi 1992) 134.

the Eastern Provinces and Trabzon had to unite to prevent this happening¹³⁰. This goal could only be achieved by the formation of a Defence of National Rights Society. This society could support the Turks in terms of their races, nationality and law. *Istikbal* was one of the earliest newspapers to demand a national struggle in the Black Sea region and Eastern Anatolia. And along with the local newspapers of Bolu, Giresun, Samsun, Kastamonu, Konya and Adana, *Istikbal* was one of the earliest newspapers to strongly support the national struggle ideas in its articles.

After actively working for the formation of the SDNR-T, on 15 February 1919 *Istikbal* newspaper announced the formation of the Society which was presented as good and beneficial news for the Turkish society¹³¹. After the formation of the SDNR-T, *Istikbal* became the publication organ of the society. The views and opinions of the SDNR-T began to be announced to the public by *Istikbal*.

The Pontus Kingdom was also dealt with as a serious problem in *Istikbal*. Faik Ahmet alerted the people to the Pontus problem as a serious duty. For Bartuçu, the Pontus problem was created by the collaboration of the imperialist powers, Venizelos and the local Greek religious elite of Trabzon¹³². The aim of the joint struggle of the Greek state, Armenian state and local Greek religious leaders of Trabzon was to create a separate Greek Kingdom or a 'Greater Armenia' in Trabzon. And the Greek religious elite and especially Metropolitan of Trabzon Hristanos were always demanding the support of the American president Wilson, British politicians and the French Prime Minister Clemenceau. So for Barutçu more than being a local problem of Trabzon, Pontus was an international problem. And for Faik Ahmet Bey, the Turks fight against it was a necessity.

The second era was between 1920 and 1923. Between these years *Istikbal* started to discuss the political problems of the whole of Anatolia and the national struggle movement. The articles of Faik Ahmet Bey became more all-emcompassing. *Istikbal* started to deal with domestic and foreign policy, assembly elections, bolshevism, local administrations and the İstanbul government's policies. This change in policy is evinced by the popular elections and the formation the National Assembly.

¹³⁰ *Istikbal*, 25 Kanunievvel 1335/1919: 2.

¹³¹ Albayrak, *Trabzon Basın Tarihi*, 107.

¹³² Ahmed, Faik, "Teşrih-i Dava", *Istikbal*, 19 Eylül 1336/1920: 1336.

Faik Ahmet Bey supported the formation of the National Assembly and believed that taking part in elections was a kind of paternalism and that people have to unite in those situations¹³³. He saw the elections as a chance to achieve national sovereignty¹³⁴. Faik Ahmet Bey and *Istikbal* newspaper strongly advised people to take part in the elections. The national assembly was the place where the wills and desires of the people could be revealed, and it was therefore the duty of the people to join the elections and send their representatives to the Assembly. It was in these circumstances that Faik Ahmet Bey opposed the Serves Treaty. In his mind, the treaty reduced the sovereignty of the state and its borders¹³⁵ and for him, the signing of the treaty was absolutely the mistake of the governments. The Serves treaty was in favour of the Entente States and it was an imposition on the Ottoman Empire:

“A victory doesn’t give any state a right to destroy a nation, and a nation’s rising social conscious against an occurring inequity should never be suppressed”¹³⁶.

Between 1920 and 1923, the issue of Bolshevism also found a place in Faik Ahmet Bey’s articles in *Istikbal*. According to him many people didn’t actually knew what Bolshevism was and he had grave doubts about Bolsheviks. Bolshevism was a political movement which could cause the Turks to forget their ultimate aim and this aim was to rescue the country¹³⁷. So for him Bolshevism was a dividing ideology and because of its capacity to divide society, Turkish society could also be divided and start to lose its struggle against the exterior enemies. Turkish society had to be united to act together. Faik Ahmet Bey also supported the ideal of national sovereignty. For him the Ottoman government was distant from the people and this distance was created by the structure of the laws which distanced people from their own government¹³⁸. For him, a structural change in the administration could reduce this distance and only the National Assembly could resolve this distance. People had to send their representatives to the assembly and so the people had to rule themselves. Within that framework, Faik Ahmet

¹³³ Ahmed, Faik, “Meclis-i Fevkalade İntihabatı Münasebetiyle”, *Istikbal*, 1 Nisan 1336/1920: 127.

¹³⁴ Çapa, Mesut, Milli Mücadele döneminde Trabzon, 16.

¹³⁵ *Istikbal*, 27 Mayıs 1336/1920: 141.

¹³⁶ *Istikbal*, 10 Ağustos 1336/1920: 164.

¹³⁷ Ahmed, Faik, “İstedığımızı Bilelim”, *Istikbal*, 13 Teşrinievvel 1336/1920: 180.

¹³⁸ Değirmencioğlu, Asuman, Faik Ahmet Barutçu, 256.

Bey supported the *Teşkilat-ı Esasiye* law. He saw this law as being beneficial to and close to the people. While drafting the law, assembly went to the public and drew up a moderately populist constitution. Faik Ahmet Bey also supported the formation of the *Society for the Defence of the National Rights of Anatolia and Rumelia Group* at the first national assembly. For him, this group could block the resolutions in the assembly¹³⁹ and he saw the formation of the Group as a chance to re-unite delegates. He supported Mustafa Kemal Pasha's aim. According to him, without political parties and groups, politics could not be conducted properly and divisions would easily occur. Faik Ahmet Bey also supported the persecution of the Turkish policy during the Lausanne Peace Conference. First of all he supported the delegates chosen for the conference. For him delegates should have full authority to solve problems and their ultimate aim should be to support the *National Pact*. The demands of all the Turkish delegates were equally important in his opinion so the delegates had to support all of the demands of the Turkish policy.

We can therefore see that between 1918-1923 Faik Ahmet Bey's arguments were close to the general spirit of the national struggle movement. In his arguments it is hard to find any sign of opposition to Mustafa Kemal Pasha, *Society for the Defence of the National Rights of Anatolia and Rumelia Group* and the way of the praxis of the national struggle movement. Until the assassination of Ali Şükrü Bey, Faik Ahmet Barutçu was an equable figure in the national struggle movement. But this changed with Ali Şükrü Bey's death and Faik Ahmet Bey started to be an opponent of the emerging regime and a supporter of the Second Group's ideas¹⁴⁰. This study will trace the change of the ideas of Faik Ahmet Bey between the years 1923 and 1925 and find out the reasons of the closing of the *Istikbal* Newspaper with the Law on the Maintenance of Order.

¹³⁹ Ahmed, Faik, "Birinci Millet Meclisi'nde Müdafaa-i Hukuk Grubu", *Istikbal*, 18 Mayıs 1337/1921: 306

¹⁴⁰ More than being conservative, Islamist, reactionary or followers of the Sultanate, the Second Group mainly fought against the formation of a personal tyranny, and they supported the sovereignty of the people which was represented on the Assembly (Demirel, 2005, 391-405). The Group wanted the formation of the rule of law, supported the freedom of speech and press and individual rights. Faik Ahmet Bey found those ideas more close to his ideological package and started to use them as a tool for his opposition.

CHAPTER 3. THE POLITICAL INCIDENTS OF 1923 AND FAIK AHMET BEY'S GENERAL RESPONSE:

3.1. MAIN ASPECTS OF FAIK AHMET BEY'S POLITICAL OPINIONS BETWEEN 1923 AND 1925: FREEDOM OF CONSCIENCE, PUBLIC OPINION AND SOVEREIGNTY OF THE PEOPLE:

The Second Group of the First National Assembly is generally defined as Islamist and Conservative by Turkish historical writing. According to the standard historical writing, sovereignty and the will of the people were supported by the First Group, and the Second Group believed in the Sultanate and Caliphate and wanted to maintain the Islamic Ottoman order¹⁴¹. The Second Group was against the sovereignty of the people because it limited the Sultan's authority. The Progressive Republican Party is considered in the same way and accused of being Conservative and Islamist¹⁴². With the effect of the power struggle which occurred within the Turkish National Movement, and in order to support Mustafa Kemal Pasha, those views continued to be expressed for many years in memoirs or historical studies and the real liberalist political agenda of the Second Group and the Progressive Party lapsed into obscurity.

The life and thoughts of Faik Ahmet Barutçu is one of the best examples of this forgotten liberalism of the opposition during the National Struggle and the Early Republican Period. Faik Ahmet Bey was a later supporter of the Second Group and a founder member of the Progressive Republican Party. During the years of the National Struggle (1919-1922) *Istikbal* Newspaper and Faik Ahmet Bey was one of the strongest supporters of the National Movement and Mustafa Kemal Pasha. He was one of the founders of the National Movement before Mustafa Kemal Pasha's journey to Samsun and he actively joined the formation of the Erzurum Congress. During the National Movement, the Newspaper supported the New Assembly, Mustafa Kemal Pasha and his policies and stayed out of the conflicts within the Assembly. To achieve unity in the

¹⁴¹ Demirel, Ahmet, "Milli Mücadele Döneminde Birinci Meclis'teki Liberal Fikirler ve Tartışmalar", *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce-Liberalizm*, 7 Vols, (İstanbul: İletişim, 2005) 164-184.

¹⁴² Zürcher, E.J, *Political Opposition in the Early Turkish Republic- The Progressive Republican Party 1924-1925*, (Leiden: Brill 1991) 1-11.

movement, the Governments of the New Assembly were countenanced by Istikbal Newspaper and their actions announced to the people. The Newspaper wanted to gain the people's support for the national independence struggle. Until early 1923, the general policy of the Newspaper and Faik Ahmet Bey was to boundlessly support the movement. More than being an Islamist or a Conservative, Istikbal and Faik Ahmet Barutçu were strong supporters of the Pasha and did not support any Group inside the Assembly.

But 1923 was the year for making structural changes to in order to form a new regime¹⁴³. From early 1923, Faik Ahmet Bey declared his wish for revolutionary changes:

The laws, the regulations and the procedures of the *ancien regime* still bind our country to the old times. We have to abandon them rapidly in order to form a modern state with modern laws, regulations and procedures. From now on we have to work to erode the old ways in order to form a modern regime depended on the sovereignty of the people¹⁴⁴.

And 1923 was the year to eliminate the *ancien regime* and refine its political structures. Mustafa Kemal Pasha and his colleagues attempted to form a new regime. But in order to make the changes, the opposition movement had to be crushed. To implement the changes, the new regime demolished the representative structure on the First National Assembly. The members of the First National Assembly were united in the goal of securing the country's independence and territorial integrity, but they were ideologically divided. There were radical reformers and political conservatives, secular minded intellectuals and men of religion, and even a few members of communist leaning¹⁴⁵. While no formal political parties existed in the First National Assembly, many small groups or factions emerged almost from the beginning. The First Assembly consisted of many different Groups, which had several ideologies and great competition and struggles occurred between these groups. However, the groups were mainly eliminated in the 1923 elections, and no opposition members were elected. The new regime broke the representative character of the Assembly and clearly damaged the relative

¹⁴³ Ahmad, Feroz, İttihatçılıktan Kemalizme, (İstanbul: Kaynak, 1999) 160.

¹⁴⁴ Ahmed, Faik, "İdare ve İhtisas", Istikbal, 21 Mart 1339/1923: 871.

¹⁴⁵ Güneş, İhsan, Birinci TBMM'nin Düşünsel Yapısı, (İstanbul: İş Bankası ,1997) 101-225.

democratic structure of it. The new regime was intolerant to the competitive politics and democratic representation and for Faik Ahmet Bey the best example of the hostility of the emerging regime to the opposition was the murder of the Ali Şükrü Bey. Ali Şükrü Bey was an elected delegate of the people who was using his right of freedom of speech and latitude of thought but he was murdered in order to destroy the pluralism of the Assembly¹⁴⁶. According to him, a new regime of absolutism was coming onto the scene, and he believed that absolute and centralised power would corrupt and had to be stopped through opposition¹⁴⁷. That opposition could bring a revolutionary change against the spirit of absolutism. And he started to find the political agenda of the Second Group closer to his ideas and started to openly follow their political agenda. He had close relations with the Second Group because many of the Trabzon delegates were in the Group, and Ali Şükrü Bey was writing articles in *Istikbal*. He later supported the formation of the Progressive Party in the same manner. As a supporter of Mustafa Kemal Pasha in National Struggle, Faik Ahmet Bey did not hesitate to support the Second Group's ideas because the Group was not Islamist or Conservative; they were against personal tyranny and supported the superiority of the Assembly, sovereignty of the people and a liberalist agenda¹⁴⁸. The Second Group supported the liberal democratical model of the 1921 *Teşkilat-ı Esasiye* Law and opposed any attempts to change the existing situation. The Law carried with it the principles of sovereignty of the people and the superiority of the assembly. The assembly was the ultimate source of decision-making¹⁴⁹. The Second Group was strongly opposed to any attempts to break this constitutional model and they wanted to keep the order in which the assembly was superior to any person or group. All of these ideas were close to Faik Ahmet Bey's political opinions, but he did not declare his views until the murder of Ali Şükrü Bey in order to avoid dividing the national struggle movement.

Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the complexity of the First Assembly represented the sovereignty of the people¹⁵⁰. And Faik Ahmet Bey believed that competitive politics and democratic representation was the reflection of the people's will. Every political

¹⁴⁶ Ahmed, Faik "Katiller", *Istikbal*, 11 Nisan 1339/1923: 881.

¹⁴⁷ Ahmed, Faik, "Hürriyet-i Şahsiye", *Istikbal*, 3 Mart 1339/1923: 878.

¹⁴⁸ Demirel, Ahmet, "Milli Mücadele Döneminde Birinci Meclis'teki Liberal Fikirler ve Tartışmalar", 164-184.

¹⁴⁹ Demirel 168-169.

¹⁵⁰ Ahmed, Faik "Zihniyet Farkı", *Istikbal*, 19 Teşrinisani 1339/1923, : 1067.

opinion had to be represented on the Assembly in order to reflect public opinion. He believed that politics, the state and especially the Assembly were the institutions in which the public opinion was best represented. Without public opinion, politics would become tyrannical¹⁵¹.

Faik Ahmet Bey's main political purpose was to draw politics and the state closer to the people because without the consultation of the people, politics would be a process which was dictated from the top down. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that in every political decision, the political power had to ask the advice of the people and take regard of public opinion. This was essential in order to achieve sovereignty of the people. He believed that even though the New Republican Regime declared itself as "Populist" and respectful to the Sovereignty of the People, it was only superficial. The principle of the Sovereignty of the People written in the new constitution was only a shallow article. According to Faik Ahmet Bey, the new regime depended on a closed elite circle that ruled the country through the People's Party¹⁵² and under these circumstances the people had no relations with the party. But Faik Ahmet Bey believed that no decision should be taken without the consultation of the people¹⁵³. So the ultimate source of political decision-making was the people. The opinion of the people was the main source to be listened to. None of the political powers, or institutions was above the people and their opinion. Decisions taken without referring to public opinion could always create conflicts and alienation for the people, and would reduce political authority¹⁵⁴.

The best way to understand public opinion depended on the principle of the freedom of speech. Debating was a natural right for the people. And every individual had the right to express his or her opinions and ideas freely¹⁵⁵. That was a natural right, which couldn't be questioned. Freedom of expression was a main part of the regimes, which depended on the principle of the sovereignty of the people. And through political debate, the people acceded into the politics. Every decision of the political power

¹⁵¹ Ahmed, Faik "Tahakküm Meyilleri", Istikbal, 16 Teşrinisani 1339/1923: 1065.

¹⁵² Ahmed, Faik "Bizde Fırka ve Fırkacılık", Istikbal, 23 Eylül 1340/1924: 1290.

¹⁵³ Ahmed, Faik "Meclis'in Müddeti", Istikbal, 7 Kanunievvel 1339/1923: 1079.

¹⁵⁴ Ahmed, Faik "Tahakküm Meyilleri", Istikbal, 16 Teşrinisani 1339/1923: 1065.

¹⁵⁵ Ahmed, Faik "Hürriyet-i Vicdana Dair", Istikbal, 18 Eylül 1339/1923: 1015.

should be opened to discussion by the people¹⁵⁶. Only absolutist regimes or tyrannies could violate that principle. Nobody should be accused by his or her expressions and no legal punishments should be applied to those expressing their opinions¹⁵⁷. Nobody should be questioned on his/her thoughts. Free discussions gave the political power indications of the direction of public opinion and decisions should be adapted according to these signals.

Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the most important element of the freedom of speech and public opinion was the freedom of the press. Newspapers were the main organs of the public opinion. And there should be total freedom for the press. Newspapers reflected the people's views and none of the newspapers had to accept the policies of the political power. They should contain criticisms, hot debates and suggestions about politics and decisions. Newspapers should not have to adapt themselves to the political power and its policies. Rather, the political power always had to adapt itself to public opinion and to its best representative - the newspapers.

The most important organ which united the people and politics was the Assembly. For Faik Ahmet Bey, an assembly was the main body which actualized public opinion and was its executive body. It is where all public opinions came together in order for decisions to be made. And it is where the principle of the sovereignty of the people became real. An assembly was bound to that principle. The Assembly therefore had to unite public opinion, decision-making and the sovereignty of the people. And the decisions had to come from down (the people) to the top (the Assembly). An assembly should exist only to realize the people's decisions. Every decision taken without the advice of the people was a violation of the sovereignty of the people. And decisions taken by the political power alone would always create trouble.

The new regime was criticized by Faik Ahmet Bey as a violator of the freedom of speech, public opinion and the sovereignty of the people. According to him, the criticism was perceived as disloyalty by the new regime and the principle of the sovereignty of the people remained on the shelf and could not be actualized. Critics, be

¹⁵⁶ Ahmed, Faik "Murakebe İhtiyacı, Istikbal, 7 Teşrinisani 1340/1923: 1058.

¹⁵⁷ Ahmed, Faik "Hürriyet-i Vicdana Dair", Istikbal, 18 Eylül 1340/1923: 1015.

it a person or a newspaper, were systematically silenced by the political centre¹⁵⁸. Opposition views, statements or articles encountered resistance from the political center but Faik Ahmet Bey believed that all of the criticism was a normal part of the idea of sovereignty of the people. The meaning of the idea was political debate, taking common decisions and freedom of speech. And every part of the political decision-making process had to involve consulting the people¹⁵⁹. Supplying and protecting the sovereignty of the people was one of the People's Parties' political principles. But the Party was doing exactly the opposite and creating a new regime of domination and tyranny. It was clear to Faik Ahmet Bey that the people were becoming alienated from the new regime.

3.2. FAIK AHMET BEY'S ALIENATION FROM THE EMERGING REGIME:

The murder of Ali Şükrü Bey, the 1st Assembly Trabzon delegate and one of the leaders of the Second Group, was one of the most controversial events in Turkish political history¹⁶⁰. It was the second political killing which occurred in the SDNR-T after the murder of the Yahya Captain in 1922. Ali Şükrü Bey's murder heightened the tension in the relations between Mustafa Kemal Pasha and the Second Group. And because Ali Şükrü Bey's murderer was Mustafa Kemal Pasha's bodyguard Lame Osman Ağa, the event was perceived as a result of the rising opposition-government conflict in the 1st Assembly. Relations between Mustafa Kemal Pasha and Trabzon were also highly tense and the cadres in Trabzon's national struggle showed their hostility by their reactions¹⁶¹. Even though Lame Osman Ağa was murdered during a skirmish by the government's troops, a great number of the Mustafa Kemal's opponents and SDNR-T blamed Pasha as the real planner behind the murder of Ali Şükrü Bey. Two days after his sudden disappearance, the leader of the Second Group, Hüseyin Avni Ulaş Bey,

¹⁵⁸ Ahmed, Faik "Şiddet Politikası", *Istikbal*, 11 Kanunievvel 1339/1923 : 1082.

¹⁵⁹ Ahmed, Faik "Murakebe İhtiyacı", *Istikbal*, 7 Teşrinisani 1339/1923: 1058.

¹⁶⁰ The roots of the conflict was about the Lausanne Conference. The Second Group criticised the Turkish Lausanne Committee. The Second Group argued that too much compromises were given from the original National Pact. One of the strongest supporter of this argument was Ali Şükrü Bey (Demirel, Ahmet, *Birinci Meclis'te Muhalafet İkinci Grup*, (İstanbul: İletişim, 1995) 505-507).

¹⁶¹ Tunçay, Mete, *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nde Tek Parti Rejimi*, 45.

clarified the Group's point of view in the Assembly. According to him, more than an assault on the delegate, the incident was an attack on the free votes and the will of the people¹⁶². He added that the meaning of the people's sovereignty was actually the free votes of the people and this was represented by the elected delegates. The Second Group's Sinop delegate Hakkı Hilmi (Uluhakan) also subscribed to Hüseyin Avni's views and said that the assault on Ali Şükrü Bey was a blow to the people's sovereignty and the Lazistan delegate Necati Memişoğlu asked the cabinet to make an official statement¹⁶³.

The attitude of the delegates was decisive and sharp. But more than the Assembly, the real sharp reaction against the murder came from Faik Ahmet Bey and *Istikbal* newspaper. According to Falih Rıfki Atay, Faik Ahmet Bey gave the strongest response, and he wrote articles which implied that the murderer was in Çankaya¹⁶⁴. And more than that, when the funeral of Ali Şükrü Bey started in Trazbon, Faik Ahmet Bey made a significant accusatory speech about Mustafa Kemal Pasha and Çankaya¹⁶⁵ which was heard by the Pasha himself. At the same time, Kapancızade Hamit Bey wrote highly critical articles in *Istikbal* in which he directly blamed the Government¹⁶⁶. After the Ali Şükrü Bey incident, *Istikbal's* relations with the Pasha and the government became irreversibly tense.

Changes also occurred in the articles of Faik Ahmet Bey on the newspaper. He was one of the strongest supporters of the National Struggle Movement between 1919 and 1922. Ali Şükrü Bey's murder was the most important event to affect Faik Ahmet Bey's view of Ankara and the emerging regime. Through the period of the national struggle (1919-1922) Faik Ahmet Bey supported, in his articles, the unity of the national forces in order to achieve success in the national struggle. For him, unity was much more important than daily political polemics¹⁶⁷. The country was in a period of crisis against foreign states, and total national unity had to be achieved. Every dividing ideology, revolutionary, populist, socialist or patriotist, and every political difference

¹⁶² Goloğlu, Mahmut, Milli Mücadele tarihi: Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Tarihi, 1 Vols, (Ankara : Goloğlu Yayınları, 1972) 171.

¹⁶³ Demirel, Ahmet, *Birinci Meclis'te Muhalefet*, 507-511.

¹⁶⁴ Atay, Falih Rıfki, Çankaya, (İstanbul: Pozitif, 2004) 368.

¹⁶⁵ Damar Arıkoğlu, Hatıralarım, İstanbul: Tan Matbaası, 1961) 324.

¹⁶⁶ Eken, Halit, Bir Milli Mücadele Valisi ve Anıları: Kapancızade Hamit Bey, (İstanbul: Yeditepe, 2008) 325-326.

¹⁶⁷ Demircioğlu, Asuman, Faik Ahmet Bey, 262.

had to be forsaken until the victory¹⁶⁸. The ultimate goal was the unity of the national struggle. During that period, for the sake of national unity, Faik Ahmet Bey supported the internal and foreign policies of the National Struggle period Governments and believed that rescuing the country from foreign occupation was possible by uniting the ideas and goals of the all members of the Assembly and the nation. Faik Ahmet Bey also supported the Government during the Lausanne Conference and did not join the opposition of the Second Group delegates. According to him, the Allied States would do everything to give fewer rights to Turkey¹⁶⁹. Imposing Turkish Liberty on the Allied States was the most important problem and it was beyond any other conflicts¹⁷⁰. So to achieve this goal, he gave his support to the Government and kept daily politics out of the Lausanne Conflict.

But after Ali Şükrü Bey's murder the whole scene changed for him. Faik Ahmet Bey's discomfort with and distrust of Ankara started with the discussions of the regime after the abrogation of the Sultanate on 1 November 1922¹⁷¹. But the most important event to lead to Faik Ahmet Bey's alienation from the regime was Ali Şükrü Bey's murder. After the murder, Faik Ahmet Bey's open opposition became distinct and he turned into a significant opponent of the policies of Mustafa Kemal Pasha, the New Assembly and the emerging new regime¹⁷². Until Ali Şükrü Bey's death, Faik Ahmet Bey had kept his articles neutral for the unity of the National Struggle Movement.

After the murder, *Istikbal*'s 878th issue on 30 March 1923 published a general article with the headline "*First Martyr Delegate*"¹⁷³. The article was *Istikbal*'s first response to the incident and heightened the tension. It was Faik Ahmet Bey's thoughts on, and *Istikbal* Newspaper's general response to the incident and discussed the sovereignty of the people and Ali Şükrü Bey. Just like the Second Group members, Faik Ahmet Bey defined Ali Şükrü Bey as a delegate who was using his freedom of opinion,

¹⁶⁸ Ahmed, Faik, "Dikkat", *Istikbal*, 4 Mart 1339/1921: 294.

¹⁶⁹ Ahmed, Faik, "Sulhe Doğru", *Istikbal*, 30 Nisan 1340/1924: 904.

¹⁷⁰ Ahmed, Faik, "İnkışafa Doğru", *Istikbal*, 13 Kanunievvel 1340/1922: 787.

¹⁷¹ Demircioğlu, Asuman, "Faik Ahmet Bey ve Cumhuriyet", *Atatürk Dergisi* 1 (Ankara Üniversitesi, 2000): 72.

¹⁷² On the standart history writing, Faik Ahmet Bey defined as a figure who became closer to the Second Group after the Ali Şükrü Bey's murder. The best example of this history writing belongs to Hüseyin Albayrak (1994). But no evidence of this thought could be fined on the articles of *Istikbal* newspaper. More than a Group conflict, Faik Ahmet Bey reflected the murder as a violation of the sovereignty of the people. And Faik Ahmet Bey blamed the government for the murder. But no Group names or Group conflicts occurred on his articles (Ahmed, Faik, "Facia Karşısında", *Istikbal*, 2 Nisan 1339/1923: 880), (Ahmed, Faik, "Katiller", *Istikbal*, 3 Nisan 1339/1923: 881).

¹⁷³ Yüksel, Murat, *Ali Şükrü Bey ve Topal Osman Ağa*, (Trabzon: Yunus, 1993) 10.

speech and conscience, which was given to him by the people. Above all, he was a delegate who was sent to the Assembly by the people and who was defending the rights of the people. He was therefore a martyr for liberty who believed in national sovereignty and self-rule of the people, freedom of the press and latitude of thought, persecuted and killed because of his beliefs.

Faik Ahmet Bey increased his tone of hostility when Ali Şükrü Bey's corpse was found after a long period of searching on 1 April 1923¹⁷⁴. But Lame Osman was still missing. From the beginning of the incident, Faik Ahmet Bey related the events as the government's doing. For Faik Ahmet Bey it was obvious that Ali Şükrü Bey was killed because of his ideas and convictions in the Assembly. And he was also sure that behind this conspiracy there was the secret support of the government. Lame Osman had his protectors who he trusted and believed that he could not be found and punished by the government. Because Lame Osman could not be found, Faik Ahmet Bey became more convinced about the help of the protectors and thought that those in Ankara were hiding Lame Osman. Faik Ahmet Bey wanted the people who pushed Lame Osman to murder to be arrested, even though they were members of the Government. He also mentioned that Lame Osman was well known for his crimes. Many formal and informal complaints had been made about him since the beginning of the national struggle, but the government never seriously charged him. Lame Osman was a Çerkes Ethem who did not defect to Greeks. Their murderous spirit was the same, but with the government's protection he was never punished. And because of his formal duty, nobody objected to him - including Ali Şükrü Bey. According to Faik Ahmet Bey, Ali Şükrü Bey accepted Lame Osman's invitation because there was nothing suspicious about it and he never thought that Lame Osman would assassinate him¹⁷⁵.

At last, Lame Osman Ağa was murdered in the Ayrancı vineyards of Ankara on 2 April 1923¹⁷⁶. In the next issue of *Istikbal* Faik Ahmet Bey wrote an article headlined "*The Murderers*"¹⁷⁷. Faik Ahmet Bey wrote of his wish for Lame Osman to be caught alive. According to him, if Lame Osman could be trapped alive it would be beneficial

¹⁷⁴ Cebesoy, Ali Fuat, *Siyasi Hatıralar*, 359.

¹⁷⁵ Ahmed, Faik, "Facia Karşısında", *Istikbal*, 2 Nisan 1923: 880.

¹⁷⁶ Kocatürk, Utkan, *Atatürk ve Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Tarihi Kronolojisi 1918-1938*, (Ankara:TTK 1988) 385.

¹⁷⁷ Ahmed, Faik, "Katiller", *Istikbal*, 3 Nisan 1339/1923: 881.

for the investigation as all the details of the murder would emerge. However, when he was killed many of the details of the incident died with Lame Osman. Faik Ahmet Bey says that Ali Şükrü Bey reported to officials that he was followed in his polling district by unknown people, and he also mentioned this to the SDNR-T and his close friends. He was expecting an assassination, but not from Lame Osman and this led to his easy entrapment.

According to Faik Ahmet Bey, Lame Osman was known as a murderer before he became a commander of the President's bodyguards. He committed many crimes and killings before his promotion and with the protection he received from the government he turned into an irresponsible criminal. So the government took him from Giresun and made a man of this unknown wretch and even while he was in Giresun, the resident population of the city officialy complained him to the ministry of the interior. The help of his protectors always, however, led to his acquittal. He then became the informal chief executive of the city and continued to commit crimes without fear of prosecution. Even the minister of the interior, Fethi Bey, protected him from the assertions of the people. With this protection, Lame Osman had the chance to carry out a political assassination. Faik Ahmet Bey strongly believed that he was spoiled by the government and thought that he could not be punished even after killing a delegate. So, for Faik Ahmet Bey, the real guilty one was the government and the protectors who spoiled Lame Osman Ağa. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the real perpetrators of the crime could never be found out, but he argued that the people themselves would be able to get to the bottom of it because Ali Şükrü Bey was the stronrgest supporter of the people's sovereignty and rights on the Assembly. He died for the rights of the people.

Faik Ahmet Bey believed that Ali Şükrü Bey's death turned over a new leaf in the country. The people had respected him, and his assassination would strenghten the sovereignty of the people. There was a group of politicians who demanded the formation of a regime based on personal sovereignty. They were the enemies of the people's rights and liberty. Şükrü Bey's death showed everyone the people's persistence

in rejecting personal sovereignty and rule, and it was seen that the liberty and sovereignty of the people would always be obtained¹⁷⁸.

3.2.1. THE 1923 ELECTIONS AND FAIK AHMET BEY'S ATTITUDE:

The fierce opposition that came from the Second Group led Mustafa Kemal Pasha and the First Group to understand that the existence of an opposition group was making decisions in the Assembly more and more difficult to reach¹⁷⁹(Çevik, 2002; 464). With the negative effect of the murder of the Ali Şükrü Bey, the National Assembly decided to hold a new election¹⁸⁰ and to recess until the 21 May. Faik Ahmet Bey opposed the Assembly's recess because the government was the Assembly and it held the executive power. The Executive and Legislative powers belonged to the Assembly according to the principle of the unity of powers, and Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the parliamentary holiday was against the rules. The government needed to be on duty at this time and not on holiday¹⁸¹.

In April 1923 the Assembly decided to hold the new elections.¹⁸² It was a common decision of the First, Second Groups and the independent delegates. The Second Group decided to not join the elections as a group itself, and the First Group joined alone. The opponent delegates knew that under the existing electoral system of indirect suffrage, only the candidates of the First Group could be elected. Dersim delegate Lütfü Fikri Bey (Düşünsel) wrote a declaration in *Tanin* newspaper about the problem. According to him, the opponents should not be elected because of the dominance of the first electors. And he asked for a transition from indirect to direct suffrage¹⁸³.

As a result of this process, the First Group, with its appointed elective list, won the elections with resounding success. According to Ahmet Demirel (1995, 571), the elective lists were mainly prepared by Mustafa Kemal Pasha with a newly formed

¹⁷⁸ Ahmed, Faik, "Facia Karşısında", *İstikbal*, 2 Nisan 1339/1923: 880.

¹⁷⁹ Çevik, Zeki, *Milli Mücadele'de Müdafaa-i Hukuk'tan Halk Fırkası'na Geçiş 1918-1923*, (Ankara: AKDİTYK, 2002) 461-486.

¹⁸⁰ Göldaş, İsmail, *Takrir-i Sükûn Görüşmeleri : 1923 seçimleri, Atama Meclis*, (İstanbul:Belge, 1997) 10.

¹⁸¹ Ahmed, Faik, "Meclis'in Tatili", *İstikbal*, 19 Nisan 1339/1923: 895.

¹⁸² Kocatürk, Utkan, *Atatürk ve Türkiye Cumhuriyeti tarihi kronolojisi, 1918-1938*, (Ankara: TTK, 1988) 385.

¹⁸³ Demirel, Yücel, *Dersim Mebusu Lütfü Fikri Bey'in günlüğü : "Daima Muhalefet"*, (İstanbul: ARMA, 1991) 160.

election bureau. He led an assembly election bureau formed from the Defence of Rights Group administrators and members of the cabinet. Therefore, only the strongest followers of Mustafa Kemal Pasha were elected with the help of the government. Elected candidates were chosen by their political positions. According to Velidedeoğlu (1990, 246), the elections were carried out under the indirect suffrage system, but that was only a formality. The Candidates preferred by the People's Party were easily elected. So, it was not a real election, but only an approval of the people to the candidates already appointed.

On the 11 August 1923, the second term of the Assembly opened and the Assembly started to gather¹⁸⁴. The 1923 elections have been defined as an election held to discharge the Second Group. According to Göldaş (1997; 12) Mustafa Kemal Pasha was intolerant of the Second Group. Because of the Group's opposition, decisions in the Assembly started to become difficult. Sabahattin Selek also mentions the Second Group's opposition as a strong one. According to him, Second Group's opposition was discouraging the First Group. But under the conditions of the era, Mustafa Kemal Pasha was patient with them. After the victory, when the elections were held, Mustafa Kemal Pasha made every effort to banish the members of the Second Group and he discharged them¹⁸⁵. But according to Samet Ağaoğlu (1999, 239), the decisions to hold a new election and to dissolve the assembly were both right. For him, the First Assembly achieved its historical goal, which was to banish the enemies from the country.

Faik Ahmet Bey addressed the new elections in many articles in *Istikbal*. According to Faik Ahmet Bey, the decision to hold new elections was instantaneous¹⁸⁶. Many new conflicts would occur with the elections and it was obvious that the elections were held in order to eliminate the opposition¹⁸⁷. Every kind of pressure was put on the opposition. He mentions that until the recent times, it was said by the majority of the delegates that the new elections would be held after the signing of the Lausanne Treaty and obtaining the national goal¹⁸⁸. And because of the Peace Conference those were the days in which everybody had to be calm. So for Faik Bey, new elections were a

¹⁸⁴ Kocatürk, Utkan, *Atatürk ve Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Tarihi Kronolojisi*, 342.

¹⁸⁵ Selek, Sabahattin, *Anadolu İhtilali*, 2 Vols, (İstanbul: Kastaş, 2004) 638.

¹⁸⁶ Ahmed, Faik, "Düşüncemiz Ne Olmalı", *Istikbal*, 21 Nisan 1339/1923: 896.

¹⁸⁷ Ahmed, Faik, "Muhalefetsiz Bir Meclis Kuvvet Olabilir mi ?", *Istikbal*, 12 Mayıs 1339/1923: 914.

¹⁸⁸ Ahmed, Faik, "Meclis'in Kararı", *Istikbal*, 5 Nisan 1339/1923: 883.

necessity arising from the infighting in the assembly. And more than a formality, the new elections were necessitated by the structure of the assembly and it was a sudden decision. The reason for the new elections was given by the assembly as to gauge public opinion on the Peace conference. But Faik Ahmet Bey mentions that in many of the decisions, consulting public opinion was much more important, but, incredibly, the assembly never dealt with it.

For Faik Ahmet Bey, holding elections was a necessity in politics and essential for national sovereignty. And for the assembly of Ankara, which gathered legislative and executive powers, making elections was compulsory for the sake of the public opinion¹⁸⁹. An election had not been held for two years in Ankara under the state of emergency, but it was an insult to the rights of the society. The timing of the elections was wrong and holding elections was not necessary until the signing of the Peace treaty. The Foreign Minister explained that the aim was to get the public's opinion on peace and economics, but this was basically untrue. If the government had wanted to get the public opinion about peace, this could have been done at the beginning of the conference. The reason for the new election was mainly the Government's disapproval of the Assembly. There was a rising opposition in the Assembly, which was blocking the Government's project¹⁹⁰. During the voting on the project, 95 delegates rejected it and the Government's power was weakened. The main reason behind the new elections was the declining majority of the Government in the Assembly. The new election was held to make a 'purified' Assembly and to purge opponents, thereby increasing the Government's political powers.

Together with the ill-timed situation of the election, electoral contests which would start after the beginning of the electoral process were also criticized by Faik Ahmet Bey. For him, the unity of the country was more important than the elections. It was a time in which the peace treaty was still under discussion and infighting could be seen as a chance by the foreign states to enforce their demands. And the electoral process needed to be calm¹⁹¹. The common will of the country should have been above the personal issues. Electoral groups had to be careful to not to break the national unity.

¹⁸⁹ Ahmed, Faik, "Meclis'in Kararı", Istikbal, 5 Nisan 1339/1923: 883.

¹⁹⁰ Ahmed, Faik, "Meclis'in Kararı", Istikbal, 5 Nisan 1339/1923: 883.

¹⁹¹ Ahmed, Faik, "İntihab Mücadelesi", Istikbal, 15 Nisan 1339/1923: 891.

If the national unity was broken, foreign states could take the opportunity to take over the country. Patriotism had to be held above the electoral process.

The lack of electoral programmes was a major problem for Faik Ahmet Bey. From his point of view, in every election parties and candidates had to have an electoral programme¹⁹² containing the political intentions and the ideology of the party and its candidates. Their opinions on significant events, and their political ideas and their promises should be written. With the existence of the programme, voters would know what they were voting for. According to Barutçu, times of elections and voting are when the idea of national sovereignty was actually and effectively brought forward. People became sovereign during those times. And voters give their votes according to the political ideology and political thoughts of the party, accept its principals and bring it to power. The delegates chosen by the people execute those principals and ideals and voters check the parties' actions. The election time is like an exam for the ruling party with every party getting its grade from the people through elections. The voter gives the grade according to the parties' actions and if they don't like the party's actions, political ideas and principals they can fail it. For Faik Ahmet Bey, this was a major right for the voters. The only chance for the voter to execute national sovereignty for his own sake is election times and voting. And for the real execution of national sovereignty, the ruling party should never intervene in the elections. Even the smallest intervention by the government or the ruling party would be to rape the people's rights. The voter should vote according to his own conscience and with his free will and elections should be totally free. That was real execution of the sovereignty of the people. Faik Ahmet Bey advised people not to vote for parties who did not declare a programme¹⁹³ and wanted to encourage political parties to declare their programmes to the voters. Elections were only a clash of ideas and it should be thus. The political programmes of the parties could only supply this.

The National Assembly was an organ which united the legislative and executive powers, so holding a just and proper election was a matter of life and death for it. And members of the government had to come from elected delegates. Non-

¹⁹² Ahmed, Faik, "İntihab Programları", Istikbal, 17 Nisan 1339/1923: 893.

¹⁹³ Ahmed, Faik, "İntihab Programları", Istikbal, 17 Nisan 1339/1923: 893.

elected delegates should not rise to ministerial positions. Faik Ahmet Bey also mentioned that the delegate of a district should be elected from the local people. According to him, the idea that Anatolia belongs to the Turks was on the rise. Every region started to defend their country. Every region wanted local delegates who knew the traditions, customs and nature of his country. People didn't want to elect foreigners and ordered delegates; they wanted delegates whom they locally knew¹⁹⁴. People started to oppose delegates who were nominated by the party headquarters. And they wanted to end the political partisanship and defend the sovereignty of the people during the electoral process.

But during the election process just the opposite occurred and Faik Ahmet Bey expressed his annoyance. All the delegates nominated by the Defence of Rights Group were elected and none of the delegates from the election list of the Second Group was elected. The People's Party enforced the public to elect their nominates and none of the opposition delegates or freethinking autonomous delegates was elected. There were many opponents or autonomous delegates in the country but it is clear that the election was held in order to supply the needs of the People's Party¹⁹⁵ and that the Party intervened in the election process and people's free choices.

3.2.2. FORMATION OF THE REPUBLICAN PEOPLE'S PARTY:

After the formation of the First Assembly, Mustafa Kemal Pasha and a group of delegates decided to form a Group in the Assembly named the Defence of the National Rights of Anatolia and Rumelia (DNR-AR). The Group, which declared a programme of two articles, was formed on 10 May 1921¹⁹⁶. Later on the Group divided into two and the Second Group formed. But with the death of Ali Şükrü Bey and the rising debates about the Lausanne conference, it was decided to form a new Assembly¹⁹⁷. During these events, Mustafa Kemal Pasha and his political partners wanted to form a new political organization with a new name and a new programme. On 6 January 1922 Mustafa

¹⁹⁴ Ahmed, Faik, "Yeni İntihabatta Anadolu", *Istikbal*, 14 Mayıs 138/1923: 916.

¹⁹⁵ Ahmed, Faik, "Yeni İntihabatta Anadolu", *Istikbal*, 14 Mayıs 138/1923: 916.

¹⁹⁶ Güneş, İhsan, Birinci TBMM'nin Düşünsel Yapısı, 577.

¹⁹⁷ Çevik, Zeki, Milli Mücadele'de Müdafaa-i Hukuk, 462.

Kemal Pasha gave a speech to the newspapers and expressed his will to form a new party around the ideal of populism¹⁹⁸. After a period of arranging a political programme, Mustafa Kemal Pasha and his colleagues declared the formation of the new party on 8 April 1923. On 11 August 1923, the second term of the Assembly opened and the 9 principles were accepted as the new political programme of the People's Party. Mustafa Kemal Pasha appointed İsmet Pasha as the general vice chairman of the Party and İsmet Pasha made a declaration, which announced that the SNDR's had become the People's Party¹⁹⁹.

Faik Ahmet Bey defined his views about the Republican People's Party after the 1923 elections. According to Faik Ahmet Bey, since the Second Constitutional Monarchy political parties' was the most controversial issue. As a revolutionary party, Union and Progress was welcomed as a party of the nation and a great majority of the people joined the Party. All of the intellectuals and citizens who opposed the existing dilapidated regime joined the revolutionary movement created by Union and Progress. But later, when the administration of the Party became corrupt, and with WWI, relations between the Party and the People deeply regressed. The people started to diverge from political parties and partisans. When the Entente Party took authority, people cut their relations with the parties and this was the success of Anatolian independence. It was not done for the sake of any Party; it was a nationwide movement involving the whole nation, the SDNR uniting every part of the country. The People's Party was now emerging above the SDNR but it was obvious that the new party would not be like the SDNR, because the SDNR was not a political organisation.

But Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the formation of the People's Party was a strong reminder of the bad memories of the Union and Progress. The procedure used during the formation and the first impressions showed that the People's Party would be similar to the Union and Progress and the parliament started to look like the Unionist era. All of the debates in the Assembly started to become Party meetings. And the General Committee of the Assembly was forced to approve Party decisions. It was just like the Unionist era. Faik Ahmet Bey defined that during the regime of the Unionists

¹⁹⁸ Güneş, İhsan, Birinci TBMM'nin Düşünsel Yapısı, 578.

¹⁹⁹ Tunçay, Mete, Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nde Tek Parti Yönetimi, 40.

all the debates in the Assembly were held secretly in to conceal events from the people. The People's Party was using the same methods.

Faik Ahmet Bey believed that in a true regime of sovereignty of the people, such incidents should never occur. Every decision should be announced to the public. On the First Assembly there were delegates who wished for open debates in every meeting, but on the Second one, the Party attempted to hide the decisions and debates from the people, and by doing so, eroded the meaning of the sovereignty of the people²⁰⁰.

3.2.3. THE SECOND ASSEMBLY AND THE NEW CABINET:

On 2 August 1923 the new Assembly opened without an opposition group²⁰¹. Faik Ahmet Bey was initially very hopeful about the new Assembly. He believed that a new age of peace and stability was coming as the war was over and that a new cabinet with new ministers had to be formed; Faik Ahmet Bey asked the reinstatement of the old ministers. The executive body had to consist of deputies who were educated and modern and appropriate for the times. Together with that he was sure that Mustafa Kemal Pasha was going to be elected as President of the new Assembly²⁰² and knew that the democratic and representative structure of the First Assembly was going to change.

The Second Assembly is mainly referred to as the "guided", "appointed", "Ataturk's Assembly" or "People's Party's" Assembly²⁰³ due to Mustafa Kemal Pasha and his delegates' domination on the assembly. The Second Group was mainly disqualified on the orders of Mustafa Kemal Pasha²⁰⁴ and this new assembly would form the new Turkish state. From the beginning of the new elections, Faik Ahmet Bey persistently demanded the existence of an opposition group in the Assembly. He believed that an Assembly without different groups could be tainted and the existence of different ideas and ideologies was necessary in an assembly in which popular sovereignty reigned. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that a government without any

²⁰⁰ Ahmed, Faik, "Firkalara Dair", *Istikbal*, 20 Eylül 1339/1923: 1017.

²⁰¹ Aydemir, Ş. Süreyya, *Tek Adam*, 3 Vols, (İstanbul: Remzi, 2001) 135.

²⁰² Ahmed, Faik, "Meclisin Küşadı", *Istikbal*, 15 Ağustos 1339/1923: 987.

²⁰³ Göldaş, İsmail, *Takrir-i Sükun*, 289.

²⁰⁴ Demirel, Ahmet, *Birinci Meclis'te Muhalefet*, 584.

opposition would always try to attain more power and that, particularly at election times, governments would always try to dictate the election process. So elections should always be free, open to all ideologies and there should always be an opposition group in the Assembly in order to control the government²⁰⁵. An assembly without any opposition was nothing.

Faik Ahmet Bey expected that the new Assembly would open with the opposition group eliminated and in the end it did indeed open without any opposition. But Faik Ahmet Bey believed that an opposition would emerge in the close future. There were so many problematic agendas, which could cause conflicts. The changes in the Kanun-u Esasi, the relations between the President and the Assembly and the election of the Committee of Delegates, would all cause conflicts. The new cabinet was formed on 14 August 1923²⁰⁶ and Fethi Okyar Bey elected as the chairman of the committee of the executive delegates. What Faik Ahmet Bey mainly demanded from the new Assembly and People's Party was the start of a new era based on welfare and peace.

On 7 September the Government's new programme was read in the Assembly. According to Faik Ahmet Bey this was the first time this had taken place in the assembly. Until that time, after the elections delegates would only come and thank the Assembly in the spirit of and under the provisions of the Teşkilat-i Esasiye Law. According to the Law, their power was beneath the power of the Assembly and this was rooted in the principle of Unity of Powers. There was equality in the Assembly between the delegates and the government. None of them was above the other and delegates' lower position was a result of the Assembly's decisions, but when the new government's programme was read to the second Assembly, the supremacy and the unity of the Assembly were broken²⁰⁷. The New cabinet put itself above the Assembly, and broke its unity and the role assigned to the Assembly was supervisory. The Assembly was forced to accept the Government's Programme, which had not been written by the all member delegates. One thing which annoyed Faik Ahmet Bey was the confidence which emerged on the declaration of the programme. Some delegates

²⁰⁵ Ahmed, Faik, "Muhalefetsiz Bir Meclis Kuvvet Olabilir mi?", *Istikbal*, 12 Mayıs 1339/1923: 914.

²⁰⁶ Kocatürk, Utkan, *Atatürk ve Cumhuriyet Tarihi*, 391.

²⁰⁷ Ahmed, Faik, "Hükümetin Programı", *Istikbal*, 7 Eylül 1339/1923: 1006.

rejected the programme during its declaration but because all these debates were held in privacy, people were not able to follow the recent events. It was the people's assembly and they had the right to be aware of every debate going on there²⁰⁸ but after a while they could not learn the news.

This was a situation that could only occur in parliaments with legislative power only and according to the existing Teşkilat-i Esasiye Law, the government should not be above the Assembly. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that this was done in order to open the way to the amendment of the existing Teşkilat-ı Esasiye Law. The new Assembly decided to change the Law and in the Second Assembly the Party meetings and debates started to be much more important. All these events showed that a cabinet-style administration would be formed. It was demanded that the government be allocated a higher and more independent position than the Assembly²⁰⁹ but Faik Ahmet Bey believed that after the government's power eclipsed that of the assembly and party meetings became much more important, the people could no longer obtain information about the debates and decisions. He believed that the Second Assembly was formed precisely to achieve that.

According to Faik Ahmet Bey there were significant differences between the 1st and 2nd Assemblies. The First Assembly represented the sovereignty of the people and it was opposed to any centralism and uniting of powers in one center²¹⁰. It was respectful to the people and to public opinion and it was functioning with the ascendancy and power granted by the people. The sovereignty and the liberty of the first Assembly was very different from that of the second. The Second Assembly had no freedom of opinion or freedom to supply latitude of thought. And its delegates' independence, opinions and actions were under strict control. The organization of the People's Party took the sovereignty from the assembly and gave it to an elite circle gathered around the Party Council. All power and sovereignty was run by the elite circle and the Council. Offering any opposition to the Council's decisions and debating or rejecting their decisions was totally banned. Their decisions could not be rejected even during the Party meetings. The Second Assembly was governed with a centralist mentality and had no freedom of

²⁰⁸ Ahmed, Faik, "Meclis Müzakereleri", *Istikbal*, 28 Eylül 1339/1923: 1024.

²⁰⁹ Ahmed, Faik, "Hükümetin Programı", *Istikbal*, 7 Eylül 1339/1923: 1006.

²¹⁰ Ahmed, Faik, "Zihniyet Farkı", *Istikbal*, 19 Teşrinisani 1339/1923: 1067.

speech and latitude of thought while the First one had strong tendencies against any personal sovereignty.

Faik Ahmet Bey believed that these differences between the two assemblies had occurred due to the method of the elections²¹¹. The First Assembly was created through the selections of the people and the election was held according to the people's will with the public freely electing their delegates. The First Assembly's capacity for representation was therefore higher than the Second Assembly. Very few actual representatives of the people existed in the present one.

3.2.4. AMENDMENT OF THE TEŞKILAT-ı ESASİYE LAW:

The Amendment of the *Teşkilat-ı Esasiye* Law was the main incident which opened the way to the declaration of the Republic. For its declaration, some of the articles of the law had to be changed²¹². It was mainly an amendment, which was made to prepare of the infrastructure of the Republican regime. The path to the declaration of the Turkish Republic began with the amendment of the *Teşkilat-ı Esasiye* Law.

On August 1923, it was announced by the newspapers that the Commission, which was preparing the People's Party's political programme, could also make an amendment to the *Teşkilat-ı Esasiye* Law. The Commission, which was arranging People's Parties' body of regulations, also started to work on the amendment to the law²¹³. According to the news, the Assembly's election period would be increased from two years to four, sessions would be held for five months, the committee of the delegates would be elected by the assembly, and for every delegation at least two candidates would be appointed by the chairman (Akin, 1998; 54). It was also announced that the right to dissolve the assembly would be given to the president. And on 5 October a committee for the amendment of the law gathered under the chairmanship of Mustafa Kemal Pasha.

At the start of the process, Faik Ahmet Bey announced that decisions about the law would be taken by the Council of the People's Party and Mustafa Kemal Pasha. So,

²¹¹ Ahmed, Faik, "Zihniyet Farkı", *İstikbal*, 19 Teşrinisani 1339/1923: 1067.

²¹² Kansu, Mazhar Müfit, *Erzurum'dan Ölümüne Kadar Atatürk'le Beraber*, (Ankara: TTK, 1997) 596.

²¹³ Alpkaya, Faruk, *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin Kuruluşu (1923-1924)*, (İstanbul: İletişim, 1998) 55.

it would be a process in which the people were excluded from deliberations and debates. Decisions would be taken secretly and the Party did not consult public opinion. The main decision makers were the Party and the Pasha and ultimately the assembly, whose main business was to take collective decisions for the people, could be forced to accept the decision without any debate. The nation was uninformed and they could only learn of changes on their admission to the assembly²¹⁴. The People's Party delegates led the country without regard for public opinion. In the end the decisions were dictated to the people as a *fait accompli*. The people, the newspapers and the public opinion were excluded from the process and they could not actively intervene. The general public thus became further alienated.

According to Faik Ahmet Bey this was totally against the sovereignty rights of the people. The People's Party was concealing the debates from the people and violating the right of the people to learn of the process of amendment. Unless the assembly held the meetings and debates openly, and took heed of public opinion and criticism, the sovereignty of the people was nothing more than a word²¹⁵. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the closed party debates could only be held in an assembly in which various parties were represented. But the existing assembly only consisted of the members of the People's Party, so the party debates were mainly hidden from the public. The People's Party declared its will to distinguish itself from the Union and Progress Party, but when the Party renounced its relation with the people and started to hold closed meetings in parliament, the Party started to resemble the Union and Progress and the People realized this. When the Party paid attention to the people, they understood that their policies were damaging their relations with the people. The Party's only connection to the people was in its name and the best proof of this was the process of the debates of the Teşkilat-ı Esasiye Law in the Assembly. It was shrouded in mystery for the people who had no idea about the debates and decisions of the delegates taking place in the Assembly. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that if the situation continued like this, people would become alienated from the Party. The amendment of the Law had to include the People and their decisions.

²¹⁴ Ahmed, Faik, "Bilmediğimiz Noktalar", *Istikbal*, 2 Kanunievvel 1339/1923: 1076.

²¹⁵ Ahmed, Faik, "Milletin Öğreneceği", *Istikbal*, 5 Teşrinievvel 1339/1923: 1031.

Faik Ahmet Bey also observed the emergence of two factions during the amendment debates, each of which supported different opinions. One supported the preservation of the Law and wanted a nominal change in the Law, and the other one supported the admission of the republican project. The conflict between these two factions was deep. Followers of the Teşkilat-ı Esasiye Law believed that general interests and the common good could only be served by the sovereignty of the Assembly. The Republicans advocated the separation of the executive power from the assembly, and supported the formation of a regime based on the broad authority of the President. Separation of the executive power from the assembly was a constriction of its powers. And if the Republicans' demands were accepted, the Assembly, which was the organ representing the sovereignty of the people and uniting the executive and legislative powers, could become a legislative parliament only. The government, which, led by the President, would become more powerful and separate from the assembly. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the assembly was preparing for the demands of the republicans. Even the Government's authority was not above the assembly; the Government had a *de facto* superiority and it was free to violate the assembly's authority. If the government became a free executive body, the Assembly's position could sink even lower. Some delegates were rejecting the proposals of the republican group in order to prevent this occurring. Faik Ahmet Bey was frustrated by both the Assembly and the opponent delegates' efforts and in the end the Government and the President would have much more authority than the Assembly whose authority would only be theoretical. The efforts of the opponents could only be achieved in a multilateral Assembly but the People's Party dominated the existing Assembly and its decisions had to be accepted²¹⁶. The amendment of the Law would be carried out without opposition.

Faik Ahmet Bey strongly believed that under the amendment of the Teşkilat-ı Esasiye Law, a hidden despotism was coming. The executive and legislative power was being gathered under the President's authority. The formation of a personal sovereignty regime was being attempted and this was totally against the sovereignty of the people²¹⁷. With the power to dissolve the Assembly, the President would be the new

²¹⁶ Ahmed, Faik, "İki Cereyan", *Istikbal*, 11 Teşrinievvel 1339/1923: 1036.

²¹⁷ Ahmed, Faik, "Hakimiyet Takyid Edilemez", *Istikbal*, 26 Teşrinievvel 1339/1923: 1048.

Absolutist ruler and his authority would be above the Assembly. Faik Ahmet Bey insisted that if this right should be given to the President, a figure elected by the Assembly could dissolve it. At the same time, the President was also the head of the Assembly. With those changes to the Law, the Assembly could find itself totally under the President's directorship and control²¹⁸ and lose its independence in making laws and regulations. The Assembly was beginning to be bound to the President's will and the right to dissolve the Assembly was the main detrimental problem.

He also rejected the four years elections to the Assembly. According to him, the people gave their sovereignty for two years and the delegates and the new Assembly had two years to make use of it. A decision like that would harm the attorneyship of the Assembly to the people. And also Faik Ahmet Bey believed that a long session of the Assembly –four years – could lead to overpowering and domination²¹⁹ (*Istikbal*, 7 November 1923; 1079). The domination by the Assembly was more threatening than the domination by the President. If there was no controlling body checking the Assembly, its gathering periods would have to be short in order to check its power. Additionally, if a change in the elections was proposed, the opinion of the people should be sought first. During the general elections, that change wasn't announced to the people, and they elected their delegates for two years. The Assembly shouldn't arbitrarily change it. If the principle of the sovereignty of the people was real, and if the people had the right to make decisions, they should be consulted. This was a necessity for the sovereignty of the people which the delegates and the Assembly had to respect.

Faik Ahmet Bey believed that all these changes were harming the principle of the sovereignty of the people and creating discontent among the public²²⁰. That principle was the root of the *Teşkilat-ı Esasiye* and could not be changed. The people gained their sovereignty by their own will and consciousness; it was not a gift given to them from above. After fifteen years of constitutional monarchy, people learned their rights and liberties and they could defend them without any hesitation. The process of

²¹⁸ Ahmed, Faik, "Bilmediğimiz Noktalar", *Istikbal*, 2 Kanunievvel 1339/1923: 1076.

²¹⁹ Ahmed, Faik, "Meclisin Müddeti", *Istikbal*, 7 Kanunievvel 1339/1923: 1079.

²²⁰ Ahmed, Faik, "Çıkmaz Yol", *Istikbal*, 5 Kanunievvel 1339/1923: 1078

change was against the Anatolian Revolution and the principles of the sovereignty of the people²²¹.

3.2.5. ANKARA AS THE NEW CENTRE OF GOVERNMENT:

The rumours about making Ankara the capital started after the signing of Lausanne Treaty but the decision was postponed until the Second Assembly. The statement to make Ankara the new capital was sent to the Chairmanship of the Assembly on 9 October²²². It was written by İsmet Pasha and signed by his 14 colleagues. The statement pointed out the perpetual importance of İstanbul as the centre of the Caliphate but demanded that Ankara be new center of the state. The strategic failure of İstanbul, the Treaty of Lausanne and the problem of the Bosphorus were named as the main drawbacks of İstanbul. In order to start a new administration of the state, it was stated that the Ankara should be the new capital. The statement came to the general committee on 13 October and was accepted with just one refusal vote.

Starting from July 1923, Faik Ahmet Bey declared his objections to Ankara as the new capital of the country. He accepted the criticism about the strategic failure of the city and he condemned İstanbul as a center of dissipation, which always stole from Anatolia²²³. The İstanbul government and administration never supported Anatolia. But Faik Ahmet believed that İstanbul had been a center of administration for a long time. And the reason for this was the mentality of the administrators, it was not the city's fault. There was an existing structure in the city. The city was modern, connected to civilisation and had been a capital for centuries. Making an Anatolian city capital would require great effort.

Faik Ahmet Bey changed his main criticisms after the formation of the Second Assembly. According to him, after the Second Assembly Ankara became a closed circle to the people. Public opinion had no part in the decision-making process. He described Ankara as disconnected from the people. There was no free environment in Ankara to announce recent news to the people. The news were only announced to the people by the

²²¹ Ahmed, Faik, "Bilmediğimiz Noktalar", *İstikbal*, 2 Kanunievvel 1339/1923: 1076.

²²² Aydemir, Ş. Süreyya, *Tek Adam*, 136-137

²²³ Ahmed, Faik, "Merkez-i Hükümet Ankara'da mı Kalmalı İstanbul'da mı ?", *İstikbal*, 19 Temmuz 1923: 970.

government, through its ideas and its newspapers. There was no free public opinion in Ankara, everything was under the control of the government. And he believed that in a circle like that the National Assembly's role would be minor. He believed that the decision to make Ankara the new capital was taken without noticing the coming opposition from the delegates²²⁴. Many delegates were opposed to it. Faik Ahmet Bey maintained that the Assembly in Ankara would always be a tool of the government but that the situation in İstanbul was different. İstanbul was better connected to the country and to public opinion. A national assembly in İstanbul would better reach public opinion than Ankara. In İstanbul, the Assembly wouldn't be an organ which wanted to make decisions by itself and wouldn't force people to accept it.

He believed that Ankara was chosen precisely for these reasons. Ankara was made the new capital to allow hidden decisions to be made and nobody would be able to reject Ankara's decisions. Ankara was the centre of the tyranny of a small class which would never be the capital of the sovereignty of the people²²⁵.

3.3. TRANSITION TO THE REPUBLICAN REGIME AND POST-REPUBLICAN POLITICS:

3.3.1. CRISES OF THE GOVERNMENT AND MUSTAFA KEMAL PASHA'S OFFER TO DECLARE THE REPUBLIC:

The Second Assembly was mainly a single Party Assembly. The Second Group was eliminated and there was not a Second Group or any other opposition group²²⁶. None of the opposition group delegates of the previous assembly was elected. But even though the Party was seen to have a homogenous structure, there was no real unity in its thoughts and actions. However, a small numbers of rivals and critics who had not yet been eliminated were able to join to the Assembly. Rauf (Orbay), Kazım Karabekir, Ali Fuat Cebesoy, Ali Fuat (Cebesoy), and other prominent leaders of the national

²²⁴ Ahmed, Faik, "Ankara'nın Tercihî", *Istikbal*, 15 Teşrinisani 1339/1923: 1064.

²²⁵ Ahmed, Faik, "Ankara'nın Tercihî", *Istikbal*, 15 Teşrinisani 1339/1923: 1064.

²²⁶ Aydemir, Ş. Süreyya, *Tek Adam*, 137.

resistance, were included in the government's list and elected²²⁷. And new opposition started to emerge in the Assembly. The existence of the new opposition collided with an era in which Mustafa Kemal Pasha gained excessive demands from the Assembly. The rise of the opposition group started during the amendment of The Teşkilat-ı Esasiye Law. Strong objections came from the People's Party delegates about the extraordinary authority of the President²²⁸. With the Assembly's new diminished authority and the President's extraordinary authorities, the regime was imposing a new order. As President of the Republic, Mustafa Kemal Pasha wanted to control the appointment of the Prime Minister and, by implication, the members of the Council of Ministers and the executive²²⁹. The regime thought that the People's Party should be divided into two factions; supporters of the republic on one side and supporters of the sovereignty of the people and unionists on the other side²³⁰.

When the committee of the amendment of the Law finished its programme, a heated discussion began between the delegates and in newspapers and a hidden political crisis started to emerge. A secret opposition to both the new rising regime and Fethi Okyar's cabinet emerged²³¹. Also, the Assembly was indisposed towards İsmet Pasha. An opposition started to emerge to the rising regime among some delegates. It was believed that more than a republic a tyranny was taking shape and even Mustafa Kemal Pasha's closest friends during the national struggle started to show their opposition to the emerging regime. Among Mustafa Kemal Pasha's closest friends, Rauf Bey moved to İstanbul from Ankara and Kazım Karabekir Pasha set off from Sarıkamış to İstanbul. Rauf Bey welcomed Refet Pasha and they met with Adnan Bey who was the government representative to the foreign states²³². On 18 October Rauf Bey, Refet Pasha and Adnan Bey met with the Caliph Abdülmecid Efendi and 5 days later Ali Fuat Pasha resigned from the ministry of inferior and vice presidency, also declaring that he would also resign from his post as Minister of Inferior. On 25 October, Rauf Bey was elected as the vice president and the opposition delegate. The People's Party replaced

²²⁷ Mango, Andrew, *Atatürk*, (London : John Murray, 1999) 386.

²²⁸ Alpkay, Faruk, *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti*, 68.

²²⁹ Macfie, A.L., *Atatürk*, (London ; New York : Longman, 1994) 132.

²³⁰ Alpkaya, Faruk, *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti*, 76.

²³¹ Kinross, Patrick, *Atatürk The Rebirth of a Nation*, (London: Phoneix, 2001) 380.

²³² Alpkaya, Faruk, *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti*, 77.

Sabit Bey with Ali Fethi Bey. They were candidates of the secret opposition. Due to their opponent positions, these changes did not receive a warm welcome from Mustafa Kemal Pasha and he decided to dissolve the cabinet on 26 October²³³. The cabinet resigned on the same day.

The resignation of the cabinet and the ministers was not unexpected for Faik Ahmet Bey. This cabinet was active during the national struggle era. It was a cabinet of the state of emergency. During those days the cabinet's main aim was the accomplishment of the national struggle and everything else was delayed. All the delegates, the whole assembly and the nation acted together like a machine to attain its goal²³⁴. But it was a situation particular to those days and after the declaration of peace it was clear that the situation would change. The necessities and duties were changing and specialization was needed. The soldier had played his part, and now administration and politics had to be left to the experts, but during the election of the cabinet this did not happen. The second assembly did not form a qualified cabinet of experts and continued with the old one which was inadequate for the new times. This did not benefit the country in any way. In order to cover its lack of ability, the cabinet used arbitrariness and did not hesitate to violate the rights of the Assembly and people, declaring a type of martial law. The cabinet violated personal liberties, and Fethi Bey claimed that these acts were necessary. The Assembly did not want to realize the inadequacy of the cabinet, and never understood that it was losing its own reputation²³⁵. It wanted to believe that the cabinet would still be able to function. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that Fethi Bey was not a man of administration. And he rapidly lost his ascendancy and reputation on the Assembly. He was a chairman of the cabinet which disregarded the Assembly and his resignation was the result of the general mistrust of his character. But Faik Ahmet Bey believed that, even after the resignation of Fethi Bey or a change in the cabinet, the crises would not be solved. Until the right to rule and ministerial chairs were given to the experts, the existing crises couldn't be resolved and the people's discontent would continue.

²³³ Aydemir, Ş. Süreyya, Tek Adam, 142.

²³⁴ Ahmed, Faik, "Vekillerin İstifası", *İstikbal*, 30 Teşrinievvel 339/1923: 1051.

²³⁵ Ahmed, Faik, "Vekillerin İstifası", *İstikbal*, 30 Teşrinievvel 138/1923: 1051.

On 29 October, the People's Party gathered to determine the cabinet. Recep Peker offered to change the voting pattern of the cabinet. Discussions started and Kemallettin Sami Pasha asked Mustafa Kemal Pasha to join the discussions in the Assembly. When Mustafa Kemal Pasha came to the Group, he made a statement which declared a change in the type of the regime and offered the declaration of the republic²³⁶. Faik Ahmet Bey believed in order to solve the crises and was of the view that Mustafa Kemal Pasha's offer was strenghtening the ongoing crises. The Party debates, which were hidden from the people, now forgot the cabinet crisis and transformed it into a crisis about the very nature of the regime²³⁷. This situation was suspicious and it was seen that the crises of the cabinet were no more than an excuse to declare the republican regime. And because of the compulsory resignation of the cabinet, the suspicions became stronger. If the regime was changed in this way, it would be a violation of the people's intentions and demands. Those who demanded a republic should ask the people and gauge public opinion. The last election was held in a secret way without asking the people's will and was a violation of the people's sovereignty. The people were declared as unconditionally soveriegn, and making a change in the type of the regime without consulting them was unacceptable. The principles declared during the elections gave leadership of the state to the assembly. The delegates' right to rule stemmed from the people, and this right should be protected. The right to change the regime or right to make an amendment on the Tekilat-1 Esasiye Law should only be given by the people - ordinary Assemblies shouldn't make amendments. If the National Assembly violated all principles, declared a republic on its own, formed a presidency and gave the President all the executive rights, it would be the strongest blow to the people's sovereignty.

3.3.2. DECLARATION OF THE REPUBLIC AND FAIK AHMET BEY:

The Republican debate started with an intervention by Mustafa Kemal Pasha which was published in the Austrian newspaper *Neue Freie Presse*. It was a statement

²³⁶ Aydemir, Ş. Süreyya, Tek Adam, 148.

²³⁷ Ahmed, Faik, "Buhrandan Buhrana", *Istikbal*, 31 Teşrinievvel 1339/1923: 1052.

which included a transformation to a republican regime. In the interview, Mustafa Kemal Pasha took the line that the Turkish State was a republic already, in all but name²³⁸. The first article of the law declared that its sovereignty belonged to the people; the second that the sole representative of the people was the Grand National Assembly. The interview was later published in *Anadolu'da Yeni Gün* newspaper. With this publication, discussions in the newspaper intensified and the interview electrified Ankara. On 27 September 1923, the statement was officially declared and it was highly criticized by the İstanbul newspapers. During those days a committee gathered to change the *Teşkilat-i Esasiye* Law. And in the end a list that included changes was declared.

In October 1923, when Mustafa Kemal Pasha engineered the proclamation of the republic and other significant constitutional changes, he neither sought the advice of the former national leaders nor informed them in advance of the proposed changes²³⁹. Many of those learned of the transition to the republican regime after its declaration. So, a wide range of different responses occurred in Turkish elite after the declaration of the Republic and those responses were mainly focused on the method of the declaration. It was perceived as a sudden event, done without any discussion. Many circles believed that there was a deliberately engineered governmental crisis which was used as an excuse to declare a republican regime. Falih Rıfkı Atay (415) describes the situation by quoting a friend:

There is nothing to say about the Republican Regime, but its declaration is a problem. Its declaration is a tricky game and it was hidden from the delegates of the Assembly. Actually, in an era in which we are always talking about the current sovereignty of the people at any time, declaration of the regime type in that way will not be readily accepted by the nation.

In his political memoirs, Ali Fuat Cebesoy (447) declared a common point of view:

The Republican Regime was declared in a very sudden way and the people perceived it as an accomplished fact of the irresponsibles and worried about the decision²⁴⁰.

²³⁸ Kinross, Patrick, Atatürk, 378.

²³⁹ Macfie, E.L., Atatürk, 157.

²⁴⁰ Cebesoy, Ali Fuat, Siyasi Hatıralar, 447.

Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the method of the declaration of the republic was a *fait accompli*. And it was unnatural. It was a sudden decision from above without supplying any agreement. One hundred and fifty eight delegates came together and declared it without any compromise. And the people also had no idea about what was going on in the Assembly during the declaration of the republican regime. They were uninformed about the process and had no idea about it²⁴¹. The declaration of the republican regime was a mystery for the people.

Following the declaration, an immediate Presidential election was held to end doubts and resistance. The Republic was declared in this sudden way because, during the amendment of the *Teşkilat-ı Esasiye* Law, it was understood that declaring the republic could be extremely difficult²⁴². Faik Ahmet Bey states that from the beginning of the constitutional changes, a conflict occurred between the delegates. Two main groups emerged: the supporters of the Republic and those who supported the preservation of the *Teşkilat-ı Esasiye* Law without any change. This conflict brought a need for a *fait accompli* declaration of the republic and conflicts and controversies between the delegates increased. This conflict even started to affect the commission of experts which had been prepared for the amendment of the Law. The experts divided into two groups over the authority of the President. The Government and its followers wanted to lower the supremacy of the Assembly and increase the authority of the President. The Committee of the Constitutional Amendment and a great number of the delegates were in favour of the opposite. A number of the delegates also wanted to keep the *Teşkilat-ı Esasiye* Law without changing anything. Because of these conflicts, the amendment process lingered on and the crisis heightened. According to Faik Ahmet Bey, all of this conflict was planned. The Government, new cabinet and the rest were all supporting the republic and extension of the rights of the President and they were inciting the conflict. All of the conflict in the committee of the delegates was planned in order to create an open position for the *fait accompli*. The conflict flared up and was used as a chance to declare the republic. The real plan behind this plot was to increase the powers of the President. After the declaration of the republic and the election of the

²⁴¹ Ahmed, Faik, "Milletin Öğreneceği", *Istikbal*, 5 Teşrinievvel 1339/1923: 1031.

²⁴² Ahmed, Faik, "Emr-i Vaki", *Istikbal*, 1 Teşrinisani 1339/1923: 1053.

President, the delegates would be forced to accept his extended powers. Following the election of Mustafa Kemal Pasha, the delegates who opposed the rights of the President would be unable to declare the Pasha as a dictator, or to voice the dangers behind the decreased rights of Assembly and the increased rights of the President. They would not be able to show the French Revolution as an example of this process²⁴³. According to Faik Ahmet Bey, the President would also be elected as the President of the Assembly and after that all the repeals which had appeared during the amendment would be approved.

Faik Ahmet Bey believed that after the declaration of the Republic, the Assembly lost a part of its sovereignty. From now on, the cabinet would be under the control of the President, and decisions would be taken under his control. The Assembly would also lose its power in the cabinet. The President gained a superior power to immunize the cabinet against all inquiries and questions from the assembly. According to him, the President had a significant effect on the Assembly during the discussions. But the Assembly had to be careful because the President had acquired too much power. Government and the Assembly were under his command. The President acquired the power to dismiss the cabinet whenever he wanted to and would, sooner or later, acquire the right to dismiss the assembly. That much power would lead to a dictatorship and so Faik Ahmet demanded that the President be calm and not harm the national revolution.

Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the spirit of the new Republic wasn't appropriate to the Anatolian Revolution and the principle of the sovereignty of the people. A Republic which did not depend on the people's decisions and sovereignty could obtain nothing. The Republic was only a title, and its real virtue was the sovereignty of the people²⁴⁴.

According to Faik Ahmet Bey even declaring the republic, the assembly did not even have the right to change the *Teşikal-ı Esasiye* Law. The people had never given the Assembly and delegates that right. But according to Faik Ahmet, nothing could be done about the decision. The Assembly shouldn't have done it by itself and that decision should have been taken by a referendum of the people. Declaring the Republic without

²⁴³ Ahmed, Faik, "Emr-i Vaki", *İstikbal*, 1 Teşrinisani 1339/1923: 1053.

²⁴⁴ Ahmed, Faik, "Bilediğimiz Noktalar", *İstikbal*, 2 Kanunievvel 1339/1923: 1076.

asking the people's will was a violation of national sovereignty²⁴⁵. Teşiklat-ı Esasiye should not be changed suddenly. The State conglomerate was above any individual or personal business and it should be constrained by the regulations and common needs, otherwise the regime would be in constant violation of these needs.

3.3.3. FAIK AHMET BEY'S REPUBLICAN REGIME DEBATES:

The declaration of the Republic and the newly rising regime caused questions to be asked among a faction of the Turkish Elite. It was perceived as a gateway to the formation of a regime based on personal sovereignty. And before the declaration of the Republic, a division occurred in the Assembly and People's Party. According to Ali Fuat Cebesoy, the division generally occurred between the followers of the sovereignty of the people, and followers of a personal sovereignty²⁴⁶. The nature and the quality of the newly emerging regime also fascinated Faik Ahmet Bey. He wrote several articles in September 1923 in reply to the republican debates in the Assembly. After Mustafa Kemal Pasha's declaration of the amendment of the Teşkilat-ı Esasiye Law, Faik Ahmet Bey started to voice his concern.

For him, the republic was a regime that was much more valuable than the one which was debated in the assembly. It was a most virtuous regime which depended on the sovereignty of the people. He defined his views in the article "*Our Expectations*" on 2 August 1923. In the article, he demanded the formation of a regime which was just, conformed to laws, and was respectful of the rights of the individual. His ultimate wish from the new Assembly and the People's Party was the formation of administrative machinery which was statutory and which would supply welfare and stability. A civilized and modern administration, which could bring progress, convenience, civilization, and whose laws and regulations were obeyed everywhere and in every situation²⁴⁷. The rights of entrepreneurs and businessmen also had to be protected. The new regime had to protect the rights of individuals; if the rights of the individual could not be guaranteed, there could be no progress, stability, business, or performance.

²⁴⁵ Ahmed, Faik, "Te'minasız Vaziyet", *Istikbal*, 5 Teşrinisani 1339/1923: 1056.

²⁴⁶ Cebesoy, Ali Fuat., *Siyasi Hatıralar*, 426.

²⁴⁷ Ahmed, Faik, "Beklediklerimiz", *Istikbal*, 2 Ağustos 1339/1923: 977.

In his early articles Faik Ahmet did not directly mention the type of regime. But later on he named his ideal in the article “*The Form of the Republic*”. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the republic was a scientific regime and was superior to the one which had been attempted in the Assembly. The Assembly perceived it only as a type of regime. But it was a regime which could only succeed in countries with a high-level of scientific progress. According to Faik Ahmet Bey there were two types of republican regime: the French and the American types. In the American type, the authority of the President, who was elected by the general votes of the people, was very intense. The President was as powerful as an emperor. Together with the President there was also a Senate consisting of the delegates of the United States. Many decisions were taken by the Senate. The executive power resided entirely in the president. Ministers had no authority. They were elected according to the president’s will. In the French model of republican regime, the President’s authority was more limited. All duties and responsibilities lay with the cabinet and the sovereignty with the parliament. The President was elected by the senate and the assembly of delegates together. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that because we couldn’t create our own model, we had to choose the closest model to the people’s sovereignty. If a republican regime was declared, because there was no senate in the country, either the president had to be elected by the people or a senate had to be formed. The election of the president should not be done by a single assembly²⁴⁸. If the President was elected in that way, he would be no different from a President of the Assembly.

Faik Ahmet Bey commented that, from the debates he had heard, the Assembly had attempted to form a Republican model which would not be like the European and Western ones. The Turkish Republic would depend on the historical and social realities of the country and European models would not be applied to the country. Faik Ahmet Bey also accepted the reality of the inappropriateness of the European types of regime. The types of regime in Europe were not appropriate to the spirits and minds of the country. But he mentioned that, in order to contrast Turkey from Europe from the West, the President’s authority should not be extended too much and the Assembly’s power should not be reduced. He believed what was being attempted in Ankara was the

²⁴⁸ Ahmed, Faik, “Cumhuriyet Şekli”, *Istikbal*, 27 Eylül 1339/1923: 1023.

expansion of the President's authority and it was seen in what ways the Turkish Republic should differ from its European counterparts. In the Turkish one, the Assembly elected the president, the Assembly had no chairman and the President was also the President of the Assembly and would control the assembly. The President elected the prime minister, and this prime minister formed his own cabinet and demanded admission from the Assembly. The president had the veto right just like all Presidents and rulers, so he had the right to reject laws in the Assembly within two months.

Faik Ahmet Bey believed that this situation was very different from the old Kanun-i Esasi and that these changes could cause alienation. Between the old Kanun-i Esasi and the new one there was a difference in the policy of the executive power and the agency of Presidency. In the new one, the President's authority was definitely increasing and it seemed that a hybrid regime (between the separation of powers and a conventional republic) was in the process of being created. In democratic countries the executive power was in the hands of the cabinet, ruler or the President. But the idea of the separation of powers was changing arbitrarily in the new Republic. The cabinet was branching from the assembly and the idea of the separation of powers was normal. The Assembly became the Parliament, which could only advise. The cabinet was formed by the Prime Minister, who was in turn appointed by the president.

The Prime Minister's independent position from the assembly was appropriate for the separation of power. What damaged this ideal was the excessive authority of the President. The legislative and executive powers, which belonged to the assembly, were now vested in the president. And this created a de facto unity of powers. The president became chairman of both the Assembly (legislative power) and the executive power. And as the head of the executive power, he appointed the Prime Minister. He had the veto right against laws approved by the assembly and at the same time as being chairman of the Assembly he was also the head of the legislative power. This excess of Presidential authority was violating the separation of powers. This was the main point which differentiated the Turkish republic from its European counterparts. The American President had an authority which was close to that of an emperor's but he was only the head of the executive power; he was the head of government and that was his only

power. His decisions had to be supervised by the Parliament and Senate. In France the President was not even the head of the government, it was out of his responsibility. The executive body consisted of the cabinet, the Assembly, and the President, who was elected by the people. In the Turkish Republic, the President was going to be elected by the Assembly. And his Presidential powers gave him the veto right against the Assembly (which was also headed by him). The President's veto right against the Assembly's decisions would be a violation of the Assembly's rights by head the assembly himself. These rights would create Presidents who were much more powerful than the assembly.

Faik Ahmet Bey believed that there were many handicaps to the Turkish Revolution. Decreasing Parliament's powers would be harmful to country. There would not always be respect for the sovereignty of the people. The Union and Progress experience was the best example of this. And the assembly of the delegates should amend the Teşkilat-ı Esasiye Law, and the existing committee shouldn't have done it. It was obvious that by decreasing the Assembly's authority, an attempt was being made to decrease the sovereignty of the people. All these efforts were aimed at forming a regime based on the President's huge authority. The President would reject the laws sent by the assembly, dissolve the assembly without consulting the people, he would elect the prime minister, and both executive and legislative powers were gathered under his authority. It was obvious for Faik Ahmet Bey that the new emerging regime was going to be based on an absolutist ruler who would govern the country by his will²⁴⁹. The Assembly's authorities were largely being eroded. The amendment of the Teşkilat-i Esasiye Law was creating a new absolutism; and in place of a hereditary sultan, an age of 'elected sultanate' was approaching.

3.3.4. THE POST-REPUBLICAN REGIME AND FAIK AHMET BEY:

Starting from September 1923, Faik Ahmet Bey voiced his annoyance with the rising regime. Before the declaration of the Republic he manifested his views. According to him, a new regime, which mounted the government and the Party above

²⁴⁹ Ahmed, Faik, "Türkiye Cumhuriyeti", *Istikbal*, 3 Teşrinievvel 1339/1923: 1029.

the Assembly, was emerging. All the debates started taking place at Party meetings without the participation of the Assembly. The Assembly became an organ which just affirmed the Party's decisions and the people began to be alienated from the decision making process and were unable to check their delegates' performance. But Faik Ahmet Bey believed that because the will of the people was represented in the Assembly, the people should not be kept away from the decisions and debates. Even though The People's Party's programme declared just the opposite, debates and discussion in Assembly were decreasing. Decisions started to be taken by the Committee of Delegates, and opposing views were prohibited. This was totally incompatible with the Populism programme and sovereignty of the people²⁵⁰. An Assembly without any opposition delegates was meaningless and Assembly meetings were becoming pointless. Faik Ahmet Bey insisted that if a populist government was to be formed, if the Assembly was the representative of the people, the situation had to change.

But what Faik Ahmet Bey witnessed after the declaration of the Republic was an Assembly which consisted only of People's Party delegates. The Second Assembly consisted of delegates chosen by Mustafa Kemal Pasha²⁵¹. For Faik Ahmet Bey, that was the most important problem with the Assembly; because it consisted of the People's Party delegates, all decisions took place without any discussion. Just like the Constitutional Monarchy era, in the populist era nothing was done by the will of the nation and public opinion. The People's Party did not let the opposition delegates join the Assembly and silenced its own delegate's rejections of decisions taken by the council and the General Commission of the Assembly. There was great pressure on the delegates, and none of them should reject anything from the Council of the Party. The Council of the Party was superior to the Union and Progress council and any delegate who dared to reject would be expelled from it. The delegates had no freedom of expression in the Assembly and in the Party. The President was the head of the Party at the same time and the council was bound by his decisions. He was also the head of the government and the Assembly.

²⁵⁰Ahmed, Faik, "Meclis Müzakereleri", *İstikbal*, 28 Eylül 1339/1923: 1024.

²⁵¹ Çakan, Işıl, *Türk Parlamento Tarihi*, 41.

Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the new regime clearly had nothing to do with populism and the sovereignty of the people. All of the authority was with a small class that was under the control of the President. The People's Party was an organization formed to unite all authority on a single centre²⁵². And because there were no other parties in the Assembly, there was tyranny of the Party. Public reaction to this situation was strong and the people's patience would decrease over time. Faik Ahmet Bey strongly believed that public hostility to the domination would grow. The people knew they didn't join the national struggle in order to form a tyranny²⁵³; they joined to win their own sovereignty. And they couldn't put up with any another sultanate and tyranny. From now on they should not be anyone's slave, nor be dominated by the palace or a person or a party. They learned the value of the freedom of conscience and did not want to see a regime in which the sovereignty of the people was used by a small class. And people were uncomfortable to see an Assembly in which all decisions were taken secretly within a small clique.

Faik Ahmet Bey believed that until the regime was totally respectful of public opinion and sovereignty of the people, people would be alienated and discontented. The new regime was a replacement of the sultanate with the tyranny of a class and a party. Faik Ahmet believed that the emergence of the new regime was a matter of concern and he was afraid of the formation of a much more dominating regime but, because of the President's position, Faik Ahmet Bey predicted such a change. He believed that after election to the Presidency, Mustafa Kemal Pasha should not renounce his relations with the People's Party. The Pasha would always continue to control the Party; even if he was elected as the President. And in the new regime he became the President, chairman of the People's Party, and the president of the Assembly. And it was obvious that he was also the permanent chairman of the Party. Now the regime consisted of one single party. But when it became a multi-party regime it was obvious that the President's position would not be neutral. According to Faik Ahmet Bey, there could never be a healthy multi-party regime under those conditions. The President had to be above party politics and party administration in order to be the head of the whole

²⁵² Ahmed, Faik, "Murakabe İhtiyacı", *Istikbal*, 7 Teşrinisani 1339/1923: 1058.

²⁵³ Ahmed, Faik, "Tahakküm Meyilleri", *Istikbal*, 16 Teşrinisani 1339/1923: 1065.

nation. A neutral president was essential in times of political crisis. During conflicts between the parties, the President had to be neutral to solve the problems²⁵⁴. But with a partisan President, conflicts would never be resolved. The President, who was the head of the government, the Party and the Assembly, united the legislative and executive powers in his authority and the meaning of sovereignty of the people was being reduced to words only. The President's disengagement from the Party and the Assembly was necessary for the sovereignty of the people. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that this was not the structure planned at the Erzurum Congress.

3.3.5. THE FIRST REPUBLICAN GOVERNMENT AND THE NEW CABINET:

After the declaration of the Republic, the Presidential election was held. In 15 minutes Mustafa Kemal Pasha was elected as the President of the Turkish Republic with a great majority. 159 delegates voted in the election and 158 agreed²⁵⁵. A new government based on the newly amended Teşkilat-ı Esasiye had to be formed. From now on, the Prime Minister and the ministers would be elected by the President himself, The Prime Minister would form his cabinet and submit his list to the President again. then the Assembly could accept it. Mustafa Kemal Pasha made İsmet Pasha his Prime Minister. He knew he could count on him to carry out his intentions in Parliament. Fethi Bey was also elected as the President of the Assembly. And Recep Peker became the Minister of the Interior²⁵⁶. On 30 October Ismet Pasha Government's Programme was read to the Assembly²⁵⁷. It was defined that, more than the words; the government performs actions and supplies welfare and comfort. And the programme of the cabinet should also be respectful to the principles declared before.

Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the new cabinet was mainly same as the old one and few changes occurred in the new cabinet. A new and detailed programme should not therefore be expected from the cabinet. Fethi Bey had made the same declarations in

²⁵⁴ Ahmed, Faik, "Fırka Riyaseti", *İstikbal*, 23 Teşrinisani 1339/1923: 1070.

²⁵⁵ Aydemir, Ş.S., Tek Adam, 152.

²⁵⁶ Aydemir 152.

²⁵⁷ Kocatürk, Utkan, Atatürk ve Cumhuriyet Tarihi Kronolojisi, 401.

the previous cabinet. Now İsmet Pasha quickly repeated them. According to Faik Ahmet Bey, because those principles and especially sovereignty of the people had been violated so many times, it meant nothing to the people. The former and the new cabinets knew that they should respect public opinion and the nation, but both the nation and themselves knew that those principles would be violated²⁵⁸. Because the nation and public opinion were not a high priority for the government they did not see the necessity to respect people's rights. And a new sultanate depended on individuals and classes being created easily. That was not the road to the welfare and comfort. Even if the decisions were not hidden from the people, there would be conflicts in any case. And it was obvious that the İsmet Pasha Government would continue the secret policies and violate people's rights.

3.3.6. THE NEW OPPOSITION AFTER THE DECLARATION OF THE REPUBLIC:

Between the end of September and early November, great debates occurred between the İstanbul and Ankara newspapers about the declaration of the Republic. The İstanbul newspapers in particular led the debates. Many articles were written in newspapers criticizing the decision to declare the republic²⁵⁹. The general criticism was aimed at the way the declaration had been made without a general consensus. It was perceived as a sudden decision, taken without seriously consulting public opinion. Rauf Orbay started a lively debate by giving interviews to newspapers. Because of his closeness to Mustafa Kemal Pasha, his declarations annoyed Ankara. The critical opinions published in the press were perceived as a threat to the new regime by the closest circle around Mustafa Kemal Pasha²⁶⁰. On 5 November Ahmet Emin Yalman wrote an open letter in *Vatan* newspaper requesting that Mustafa Kemal Pasha be calm and patient against the critics and rejections for the good of the country. Yalman warned the Pasha about the formation of a dictatorial Single Party Regime.

²⁵⁸ Ahmed, Faik, "Umdelere Sadakat", *İstikbal*, 2 Teşrinisani 1339/1923: 1054.

²⁵⁹ Alpkaya, Faruk, *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti*, 104-114.

²⁶⁰ Yalman, Ahmed Emin, *Yakın Tarihte Gördüklerim ve Geçirdiklerim*, 2 Vols, (İstanbul: Pera Turizm ve Ticaret, 1997) 887.

Against those critics in the press, the Minister of the Interior Ferit Bey made a statement in the *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* newspaper. It was declared that the government should protect public security against opposition circles and damaging movements. The opposition newspapers were condemned as gossips who violated the emerging regime and some measures were adopted for the common good. Ferit Bey deliberately spread rumours about the type of regime among the intellectuals to advance national and economic progress.

Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the reaction of the Minister of Interior was a natural. What occurred in the newspapers was a righteous public reaction to the wrong decisions and outrages. If the newspapers declared their opposition, it was the fault of the ruling class. There was not a common general reaction against the type of regime but there was a rising discontent. The people were not happy and the Government and Ankara had to discover the reasons for the nation's discontent. Ankara should try to understand why it could win the people over. The clues to the public discontent were in the newspaper articles. And in order to understand, Ankara should use the newspapers to find out the reasons of the public discontent. That was the only way to stop the gossip and public discontent.

The rulers had to listen to public opinion and they should rule the country without harming it. Public opinion should not be shown as a part of the conscious and envious masses. And the common and general criticisms and warnings of the press should be perceived as the inclinations of public opinion and they should be used to understand the points which rankled with the people. If the Government accused the public and the free press of rumour-mongering, this would harm the common good and show disregard for public opinion. The only common good was to respect public opinion and the sovereignty of the people. The criticism in the press of the declaration of the Republic had to be perceived in that way. The rejections and critics of the newspapers was not about the type of regime but what was criticized was the unauthorized position of the Assembly and the disrespect for public opinion and the sovereignty of the people²⁶¹.

²⁶¹ Ahmed, Faik, "Muhalefet Cereyanları", *Istikbal*, 4 Teşrinisani 1339/1923: 1055.

On 31 October Rauf Bey gave an interview to the editor of the *Tevhid-i Efkar* newspaper Velid Ebüzziya Bey and *Vatan* newspapers' editor Ahmet Emin Bey²⁶². In the interviews Rauf Bey described the declaration as an instantaneous decision and also mentioned that public opinion was not seriously considered during the declaration. And he also declared that the real power of a government lay in its respect for the sovereignty of the people and the National Assembly. For Rauf Bey the decision to declare the Republic should have been taken after consulting the people.

Faik Ahmet Bey supported Rauf Bey's opinions. According to him, Rauf Bey was voicing his fears about the violation of public opinion. And from Rauf Bey's point of view it was proved one more time that the people had a common point of view about the sudden declaration of Republic²⁶³. It became much more obvious that a social compromise would not be achieved over a decision which was taken in 4 hours. And Rauf Bey's declaration emphasized this.

Later on, Rauf Bey's interview caused conflicts in the People's Party and both İsmet Pasha and the Party strongly protested Rauf Bey's declarations. He was accused of threatening the republic and defined as a traitor who wished to divide to People's Party and form a new Party. Afterwards it was decided to hold a Party meeting to debate the problem and an explanation was demanded from Rauf Bey. At the meeting Rauf Bey declared that he was not a follower of the sultanate or a constitutional monarchy²⁶⁴ and mentioned that the only point he was opposed to was the abruptness of the declaration of the Republican regime.

According to Faik Ahmet Bey, it was obvious that Rauf Bey was a follower of a republican regime and the Party shouldn't even question his republicanism. But together with it, he was follower of the sovereignty of the people and said that every republic should be based on it. But Rauf Bey claimed that the public wanted to know the reason for the instantaneous changing of the regime and he asked the Party and Assembly to explain it to the nation. According to Faik Ahmet Bey this was the most crucial part of Rauf Bey's statement but was not dealt with inside the Party. The meeting about Rauf

²⁶² Alpkaya, Faruk, *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti*, 107.

²⁶³ Ahmed, Faik, "Muhalefet Cereyanları", *İstikbal*, 4 Teşrinisani 1339/1923: 1055.

²⁶⁴ Orbay, Rauf, *Siyasi Hatıralar*, (İstanbul: Örgün, 2003) 563-565.

Bey was held to understand the consequences of his interview on public opinion²⁶⁵. When they understood that it would not have a huge impact on the people, the issue was quickly dropped. A declaration that he should not resign from the Party was also demanded from Rauf Bey. When he said he had no intention of doing so, the Party's discomfort ended, but what was important was the public's views on these incidents.

Faik Ahmet Bey believed that behind these arguments in the People's Party there were rising personal conflicts. These were not conflicts over principles but personal rows. And behind Rauf Bey incident, there was a rising discontent between him and İsmet Pasha²⁶⁶. İsmet Pasha disagreed with Rauf Bey's statements. It was not a conflict of principles because the People's Party had none, nor any political programme. One day the Party supported the regime of the National Assembly, and the next they turned into republicans. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the personal conflicts on the Party were harming the affairs of the nation and the People's Party was forgetting its duties to the people. The only winner in those debates was Rauf Bey and because he was supported on the points he mentioned in the İstanbul newspapers, his personal authority grew. Because he met with the Caliph and made critical comments in the newspapers, the Party tried to show him as a traitor. But after his advocacy, his support in the Party increased. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that what the Party tried to do to Rauf Bey should only have happened in the Abdulhamid era²⁶⁷. Rauf Bey had the right to meet with everyone he wanted to and his criticisms were natural.

Opposition to the new decisions also came from the delegates. According to Faik Ahmet Bey, the most significant one came from the Erzurum delegate Hodja Raif Efendi's statement in the *Tevhid-i Efkar* newspaper. Raif Efendi was a member of the People's Party and the statement was about the recent changes. For the first time a People's Party delegate voiced his complaints about the new policies. Raif Efendi declared that a significant opposition existed in the People's Party and it was concerned with the sudden decisions taken by the Party²⁶⁸. He warned the Party about the hostility to the instantaneous decisions. According to Faik Ahmet Bey, Hodja's statement was a

²⁶⁵ Ahmed, Faik, "Münakaşanın Neticesi", *İstikbal*, 4 Kanunievvel 1339/1923: 1077.

²⁶⁶ Ahmed, Faik, "Meselenin Hitamı", *İstikbal*, 28 Teşrinisani 1339/1923: 1074.

²⁶⁷ Ahmed, Faik, "Münakaşanın Neticesi", *İstikbal*, 4 Kanunievvel 1339/1923: 1077.

²⁶⁸ Alpkaya, Faruk, *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti*, 123.

significant event for understanding the situation of the Party and it was a sign of the existence of the delegates in the Party who were respectful to public opinion. The decision to declare the Republican Regime, which was taken in four hours, caused discomfort among the public, in the Assembly and within the Party. The decision was generally perceived as a *fait accompli*. The attendance of the 158 delegates at the Assembly was proof of the disharmony behind the decision and a majority vote could not be achieved during the decision making. Now open hostility emerged in the Party.

Faik Ahmet Bey believed that, Raif Efendi's opposition was just a signal of the coming problems. The growing resistance of the delegates came from the ideological structure of the Party. The principles of the Party's ideology were general and all-encompassing and should not even form a party programme. They could be the political programmes of any party. The only principle unique to the Party's programme concerned the type of regime, the people's sovereignty, but it was sabotaged by the party itself and lost its power to unite. The latest decision on the declaration of the Republican regime was a violation of the party's own programme and so the emergence of an opposition inside the party was not unexpected. The Party's programme depended on the superiority of the Assembly over the Party but the party itself violated that principle.

Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the People's Party was not an ideological one. The unity of the Party had been corrupted and delegates started to show their discontent and, in Faik Ahmet's view, this was unavoidable²⁶⁹. The emergence of more oppositions and more divisions in the Party was a significant probability and the disbanding of the Party was also a possibility.

3.3.7. THE NEW STRUCTURAL CHANGES AFTER THE DECLARATION OF THE REPUBLIC:

The incidents which occurred at the end of the 1923 brought the beginning of a new regime. The Republic was formed; İsmet Pasha became the Prime Minister and the President acquired extraordinary authorities. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that all these incidents were part of a greater plan by the Party. The Regime had a hidden agenda

²⁶⁹ Ahmed, Faik, "Meclis'te Muhalefet", *Istikbal*, 20 Teşrinisani 1339/1923: 1068.

which they wanted to achieve and until it succeeded, the changes would continue. The first of these changes was the declaration of the Republic. So Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the new regime was trying to make structural changes and every incident was a part of this process²⁷⁰. Until those changes were applied, the Teşkilat-ı Esasiye would not appear in its final form. It was now time to make structural changes which could eliminate the old ones.

One of the structural changes was the elimination of the SDNR. From now on the government wanted to transform the existing independent of the SDNR into the centralist People's Party. After the formation of the People's Party the 9 Principles were declared. The Programme was declared by Mustafa Kemal Pasha as head of the SDNR-AR (Anatolia and Rumelia) Society on 8 April 1923²⁷¹. It was announced in the programme that the SDNR-AR Group was going to be transformed into the People's Party. The programme was sent to the SDNR-AR Societies and the strongest response came from the Trabzon SDNR. Trabzon was still furious at the death of Ali Şükrü Bey and the news of transformation raised the tension in the city. The SDNR-T, its chairman Barutçuzade Ahmet Bey, *Istikbal* newspaper and Faik Ahmet Bey opposed the decision taken by İsmet Pasha and Ankara²⁷². It was told by the SDNR-T that a regime dependent on personal sovereignty was emerging and Faik Ahmet Bey wrote articles to explain the position of the SDNR-T.

First of all, Faik Ahmet Bey made clear that the SDNRs were national societies which had definite principles and that according to their code of rules, a political party should not envelop the societies. They had a will which was above politics: supplying the security of the country and achieving national sovereignty. The code of rules written at the Sivas congress provided that the Societies were independent of any political party and every Muslim should be a member of them. SDNRs had no relation with a party - they were united under ideals. And that ideal was a national one, which embraced the entire nation. The Societies were above any party programme and they could not be dragged into political conflicts²⁷³.

²⁷⁰ Ahmed, Faik, "Yeni Mesele", *Istikbal*, 18 Teşrinisani 1339/1923: 1066.

²⁷¹ Çevik, Zeki, *Milli Mücadele'de Müdafaa-i Hukuk*, 471.

²⁷² Uyar, Hakkı, *Tek Parti Dönemi ve Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi* (İstanbul: Boyut, 1999) 74.

²⁷³ Ahmed, Faik, "Bir Tahlil", *Istikbal*, 10 Mayıs 1339/1923: 913.

According to Faik Ahmet Bey, the decision of transition could lead to a personal and despotic rule. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that this was an order from the Chief Executive to the SDNRs. But the SDNRs were societies formed by the will of the people in order to defend the country and nation. They had been formed, even before the people on the present government went to Anatolia to take part in the national struggle. So, they were local and could not be dominated by a political party. What was done to the SDNRs was a coup d'etat²⁷⁴. The government didn't have the right to interfere with the Societies, which has been formed by the people in accordance with the law of associations. SDNR were societies which had not been formed by the will of the government so it was unacceptable for them to transform themselves by the will of the government. The People's party was an organ formed by the people who shared the same political ideas and ideals and those who adopted its political programme should register with the party. Political parties were formed around common goals and aims, and not everyone has to accept the party's views. It was unacceptable to attempt to unite the public in a single party. The SDNRs belonged to the nation, and the government should not interfere with them.

According to Faik Ahmet Bey, the SDNRs were not political societies. Their aims and goals were not about politics. They were formed in order to form national independence from the enemies, and transforming them into a political party would be illegal²⁷⁵ (Istikbal, 26 October 1923; 1070). If a decision was made about the SDNR's it should only be done by the societies' themselves through a general congress. The only political organ which could define their faith were the SDNR's themselves. The SDNR's couldn't be the property of any other political party. Faik Ahmet Bey called on the SDNR'S not to obey to the People's Party and Chief Executive's demands and asked them to form a congress to determine their own fate. According to him, the SDNR's succeeded, the fatherland was rescued and it was time for the SDNR's to gather around and define their future. He was convinced that this congress should be held in Trabzon.

²⁷⁴ Ahmed, Faik, "Fırka Riyaset", Istikbal, 23 Teşrinisani 1339/1923: 1070.

²⁷⁵ Ahmed, Faik, "Fırka Riyaset", Istikbal, 23 Teşrinisani 1339/1923: 1070.

In the end, despite Faik Ahmet Bey's efforts, a commission consisting of two delegates was sent to Trabzon by Ankara and the former central committee of the SDNR-T was dissolved and a new one was appointed²⁷⁶.

At the end of 1923 the abolition of the Caliphate also started to be debated. The new regime didn't want to continue the existence of the institution. The debates started with the publication of the letter of the Aga Han and Emir Ali of India in Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın's *Tanin* newspaper on 24 November²⁷⁷. The letter was about the protection of the political existence of the Caliphate. Before the publication of the letter, Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın and Lütfi Fikri Bey had also written articles against the abolition. On 11 November Hüseyin Cahit argued that with the abolition, the Turkish State would turn out to be an insignificant State in the Islamic world, and on 10 November Lütfi Fikri Bey declared his wish for the project to be cancelled²⁷⁸. With the efforts of the *Tanin* newspaper, the debates were diffused to the public and in the end Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın was arrested. The managers and owners of the *Tevhid-i Efkar* and *İkdam* newspapers were also arrested. The hostility of the new emerging regime to the caliphate increased with these incidents and a debate in the Assembly and in the newspapers emerged. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that, after the declaration of the Republican Regime, debate on the situation of the Caliphate was the second important structural change in the Regime and it was a part of the Party's preconcerted plan. The issue was opened to debate because the regime wanted to understand public opinion on the structural change. During the declaration of the Republican regime the same things occurred, but when it was understood that public opinion rejected the decision, it was declared as a *fait accompli*. And the same method was going to be applied to the caliphate and it would be removed abruptly from the Ottoman Sultanate. It would be an affront to the Sultanate and Caliphate. The Caliphate was a significant source of power and influence for the country and any decision about it had to be cautious. After all this expenditure of effort, the Caliphate shouldn't lose its power. It was the main institution which connected the Turks to the Islamic world and brought significant political power and the spiritual and material respect of Muslims all around the world.

²⁷⁶ Tunçay, Mete, Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nde Tek Parti Yönetimi, 45.

²⁷⁷ Aydemir, Ş.S., Tek Adam, 160.

²⁷⁸ Topuz, Hıfzı, Türk Basın Tarihi, (İstanbul: Remzi, 2003) 144.

Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the decision about the Caliphate was a suspicious one. There were debates which argued that the Caliph should be elected from the delegates of the Islamic World. According to him, there was an effort to transfer the Caliphate to the President. The President wanted to be the Caliph at the same. And the delegates of the Muslim World should make the decision. But Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the right of the Caliphate belonged to the Ottoman Dynasty, Turkey and the Turks. It was their inalienable natural right and none of the other Muslim communities had a right to vote in the election of the Caliph²⁷⁹.

Faik Ahmet Bey believed that after those structural changes, a new constitution –a Kanun-i Esasi–would be prepared. After the forced declaration of the Republican Regime, now it was time to make a written document of the new regime. Now the Assembly was going to finish the structure that it wanted to form. Declaration of the Republic and election of the President were the first incidents of the Party’s hidden programme.

But the new constitution was going to be made in order to extend the already overflowing authority of the President²⁸⁰. The new constitution was going to regulate the relations of the President and the Assembly and put into writing his authority over the cabinet. And after that, the new Republic would be under the control of the President which, in effect, would mean a new sultanate.

3.3.8. THE LAW OF THE HIGH TREASON AND THE ISTANBUL INDEPENDENCE COURT :

Within the abolishment of the Sultanate and the declaration of the Republican regime, a rising hostility also emerged on the subject of the abolishment of the Caliphate. This hostility mainly emerged in the Istanbul newspapers. The leading opposition newspapers were the *Tanin*, *Tevhid-i Efkar*, and *Sebil’ül Reşad* and Hüseyin Cahit, Ahmet Emin, Velit Ebüzziya, Eşref Edip were perceived as the significant

²⁷⁹ Ahmed, Faik, “Yeni Mesele”, *Istikbal*, 18 Teşrinisani 1339/1923: 1066.

²⁸⁰ Ahmed, Faik, “Yeni Kanuniesasi”, *Istikbal*, 12 Teşrinisani 1339/1923: 1062.

opposition journalists²⁸¹. They were opposed to the structural changes that occurred after the 1923 elections. But with the publication of the letter of the Aga Han and Emir Ali, the regime's hostility to the newspapers increased. Because the letter was published in the newspapers before passing into his hands, İsmet Pasha became frustrated and decided to put the issue onto the agenda of the Assembly. On 8 January 1923, the Assembly started discussions and İsmet Pasha declared that the publication of the letter, which belonged to the Presidency of the Republic, was a crime of high treason and demanded the formation of Independence Courts²⁸². Afterwards, İsmet Pasha's offer was accepted by the Assembly and the Istanbul Independence Court decided to arrest the journalists on 9 January. They were charged under the 1st article of the Law of High Treason.

Faik Ahmet Bey perceived the Independence Courts as unjust institutions. The main reason for his hostility was based on the structure of the institutions. The Independence Courts were institutions whose decisions were absolute and could not be appealed²⁸³. The court's decisions were irrevocable and the Assembly could only authenticate the death penalty. But Faik Ahmet Bey believed that all decisions of the court had to be authenticated by the Assembly. Independence Courts couldn't be independent from political inspection. And he believed that under those circumstances unjust decisions could be taken for the arrested journalists. For Faik Ahmet Bey the arrest of the journalists was a deep disappointment for all those who believed that the new Republican Regime could bring real freedom and would not violate liberties²⁸⁴. The great majority of people believed that after fifteen years of revolution, the domination of parties and partisan politics, a new regime now respected the fundamental freedoms formed. Many people had witnessed the results of the spirit of years of domination and despotism and thought that it had now ended. But after a great revolution which ended the despotism of the Palace and Sultanate, a regime of freedom could still not be formed. Although the people had started to believe they had achieved their liberty, the new regime was still perpetuating the habits of the old one. It was

²⁸¹ Aybars, Ergün, *İstiklal Mahkemeleri*. (İzmir: Zeus, 2006) 141.

²⁸² Aybars 144.

²⁸³ Ahmed, Faik, "Kanunun Tefsiri", *İstikbal*, 4 Kanunısani 1339/1923: 1097.

²⁸⁴ Ahmed, Faik, "Samimiyet İhtiyacı", *İstikbal*, 9 Kanunievvel 1339/1923: 1080.

obvious that the new republic would not grant the sovereignty of the people. It was obvious that those in power couldn't tolerate the principle of sovereignty of the people, liberty and freedom of conscience and they used terror whenever it was thought necessary. The decision to arrest the journalists was proof of this situation. The attitude of the Republican Government was openly contrary to the ideal of a Republic.

Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the only fault of the journalists was to affirm their thoughts freely and believe in the latitude of thoughts. Lütfi Fikri Bey, in particular, was known for his intellectual independence and he used to use his right to freedom of speech and conscience²⁸⁵. His articles usually consisted of criticisms and he had always been an important opponent. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the only reason for Lütfi Fikri Bey's and other journalists' arrest was to silence the press. The journalists, who had to be independent, were only criticizing the applied policies, but the government was intolerant to it. The government didn't want its mistaken policies to be seen by the public²⁸⁶. The government was forcibly violating the freedom of speech and the expression of thoughts. But violating the freedom of conscience and suppressing the Press was against the ideal of a Republic and the republican regime. Violence shouldn't a method for a republican regime. The virtue of the republic was to please its people, being respectful to acts depending on the rule of law. A republican regime should not violate the liberty, freedom of conscience and freedom of the press and should not be finding excuses for violations. If the violations were made, the republican regime would be like the hated regime of the Damat Ferit Pasha Government. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that if the Republican Regime continued in that way, the people's dreams would be broken and they would start to distance themselves from the new regime, thinking that the founders of the republican regime were far from the ideal of republic.

Faik Ahmet Bey also defended the abolition of the Independence Courts. After the formation of the Republican Regime and restoration of the peace, a political and social order came to Turkey and the period of revolution ended. Independence courts were institutions of the martial law. Bringing suits was now the domain of the judicial courts, which respected the rule of law. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that when the Ankara

²⁸⁵ Ahmed, Faik, "Günün Meselesi", Istikbal, 23 Kanunievvel 1339/1923: 1089.

²⁸⁶ Ahmed, Faik, "Şiddet Politikası", Istikbal, 11 Kanunievvel 1339/1923: 1082.

Government failed to silence the Istanbul newspapers' criticism through affirmative and smooth methods, it decided to silence them forcibly through the Independence courts²⁸⁷. The Istanbul newspapers were declared to be traitors to the country who served the enemy. But according to Faik Ahmet Bey, they were only criticising the policies of the government and their criticism had nothing to do with the service to the enemies. The criticisms were internal and concerned the mistakes of the government. Istanbul newspapers always supported the government in foreign affairs and in the national action. The Istanbul newspapers had always supported national independence and fought for the movement. They simply pointed out that a republic had to be virtuous, respectful of public opinion and freedom of conscience and had to be formed according to the rule of law. That was not treason or serving the enemy - just pointing to the failures of the regime. And Faik Ahmet Bey strongly demanded that the new regime be respectful to the laws and supply the freedom to criticize. Critics of the government should not be sent to the Independence courts. The whole process was against the sovereignty of the people.

At the same time Lütfi Fikri Bey's trial also started. He was accused on account of his articles about the abolition of the caliphate²⁸⁸ and was also adjudicated under the 1st article of the Law of the High Treason (inciting the people to mutiny). But Faik Ahmet Bey believed that his only fault was his declaration in which he explained that he preferred a constitutional monarchy to a republican regime²⁸⁹. This was not a revolt; it was only exercising the freedom of speech. Lütfi Fikri Bey's speeches and articles had nothing to do with High Treason but he was sentenced to five years of rowing. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that after this trial, everyone who criticized the government could be charged with high treason. Lütfi Fikri Bey was only voiced his ideas and said that he would prefer the constitutional monarchy to the new regime. From now on, anyone advocating parliament or constitutional monarchy could be charged with high treason and adjudicated as this trial could be a precedent. Faik Ahmet Bey demanded the intervention of the Assembly and delegates if the court took an inappropriate decision. Even though the Independence Courts could not change their decisions, Faik Ahmet

²⁸⁷ Ahmed, Faik, "Matbuatın Hürriyeti", Istikbal, 12 Kanunievvel 1339/1923: 1083.

²⁸⁸ Aybars, Ergün, İstiklal Mahkemeleri, 151.

²⁸⁹ Ahmed, Faik, "Kanununun Tefsiri", Istikbal, 4 Kanunisanı 1339/1923: 1097.

Bey believed that an unjust decision on Lutfi Fikri Bey had to be cancelled²⁹⁰ and he demanded the formation of a Court of Appeal. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that if any unjust decision was taken, the Assembly should interfere in the trial. According to him, it was duty of the delegates and the Assembly²⁹¹.

When the decision was declared by the Court and Lutfi Fikri Bey was punished, Faik Ahmet was still insistent that the Assembly and the delegates had to interfere and reverse the judgement²⁹². According to him, the Court's decision was instantaneous and groundless, and the Law of the High Treason gave the right of authentication of the Independence Court's decisions to the Assembly. And it was obvious that Lutfi Fikri Bey was innocent. A Republic was a regime of liberties and sovereignty of the people and Faik Ahmet Bey believed that these trials were inappropriate. Lutfi Fikri Bey was a precious national figure and his acquittal would be good example of the justice of the Republic²⁹³.

In the end Lutfi Fikri Bey and the other journalists were discharged of their crimes by the decision of the Assembly on 13 February 1924²⁹⁴. Faik Ahmet Bey perceived the event as a fair and proper legal assessment. He believed that charging the Istanbul journalists and Lutfi Fikri Bey with high treason was an unjust event from the beginning. They were only legally expounding their hostility and not inciting the people to revolt and they were only using their freedom of expression²⁹⁵ which was their right. Faik Ahmet Bey also mentioned that the result was also perceived as a just and fair decision by the public. According to him, the people wanted to see a peaceful and accredited regime²⁹⁶. They demanded the total collaboration of the intellectuals and the state. And with these incidents, the people were measuring the regime's respect for the laws. Faik Ahmet Bey and the public perceived the incident as unjust but he was afraid that the trial could be a precedent²⁹⁷.

²⁹⁰ Ahmed, Faik, "Bir Düşünce", *Istikbal*, 2 Kanunısani 1339/1923: 1096.

²⁹¹ Ahmed, Faik, "Hüküm Arifesinde", *Istikbal*, 7 Kanunısani 1339/1923: 1091.

²⁹² Ahmed, Faik, "Bir Düşünce", *Istikbal*, 2 Kanunısani 1339/1923: 1096.

²⁹³ Ahmed, Faik, "Hüküm Arifesinde", *Istikbal*, 7 Kanunısani 1339/1923: 1091.

²⁹⁴ Kocatürk, Utkan, *Atatürk ve Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Tarihi Kronolojisi*, 408.

²⁹⁵ Ahmed, Faik, "Hayırlı Alamet", *Istikbal*, 7 Kanunısani 1339/1923: 1099.

²⁹⁶ Ahmed, Faik, "Af Kararı", *Istikbal*, 25 Şubat 1339/1923: 1126.

²⁹⁷ Ahmed, Faik, "Kanunun Tefsiri", *Istikbal*, 4 Kanunısani 1339/1923: 1097.

CHAPTER 4. THE PATH TO THE OPEN OPPOSITION, EVENTS OF 1924 AND THE FORMATION OF THE PROGRESSIVE REPUBLICAN PARTY:

4.1. 1923 –1924 POLITICAL EVENTS AND FAIK AHMET BEY:

1923 was a year of struggle for Faik Ahmet Bey. He has seen the death of one of his closest friends, Ali Şükrü Bey, and witnessed the formation of a Republican regime without general consent. The SDNR-T, which started a very early national struggle movement, was forced by the new regime to change its structure and administration. As a Republican, Faik Ahmet Bey was not content with the emerging Republican regime. He believed that a republican regime had to include liberal rights, and it had to respect to the people's sovereignty. The general situation of the 1923 political events was summarized in an article called "*Violence Policy*" by Faik Ahmet Bey²⁹⁸. He wrote that the majority of the people believed that, after the declaration of peace, a new regime which was respectful to liberties and sovereignty of the people would be formed. The new regime shouldn't violate any rights and a real era of liberty was coming. But all those dreams had been broken especially after the formation of the Istanbul Independence Court for the journalists. It was seen that the new regime was using violence to silence the opposition.

Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the Party was going to make the revolutionary structural changes in any case, because Mustafa Kemal Pasha wanted it this way. The Pasha openly declared his wish to remove religion from politics at the beginning of the year. And Faik Ahmet Bey mentioned that any thought and offering from the Pasha had to be accepted by the Assembly. The revolutionary changes were therefore certain to succeed²⁹⁹.

During 1923 Faik Ahmet Bey announced his opposition through his articles in *Istikbal* Newspaper. But in 1924 he would take action and he joined the formation of the

²⁹⁸ Ahmed, Faik, "Şiddet Politikası", *Istikbal*, 11 Kanunievvel 1340/1924: 1082.

²⁹⁹ Ahmed, Faik "Son Vaziyet", *Istikbal*, 2 Mart 1340/1924: 1131.

Progressive Republican Party. According to him, the Party followed liberalism and sovereignty of the people, and it was Republican at heart. Along with that, he continued to fight the new Regime in his articles. In 1924 he strongly criticised the 1924 Constitution, accusing the new regime of trying to form a new tyranny. The 1924 Constitution gave extraordinary rights to the President and it was a return to the Sultanate. Faik Ahmet Bey also opposed the hardliners inside the Republican Regime but, at the same time, supported the radical changes of 1924. As a republican he did not write directly critical articles about the structural changes, preferring to give suggestions to the regime. But he opposed the centralisation of the municipalities because of his rejection of centralism. He advocated a new Press Law, an independent institution of the Caliphate and the abolition of the foreign institutions. Faik Ahmet Bey was sure that structural changes had to be made for the formation of a republican regime.

4.2. THE REVOLUTIONARY CHANGES AND FAIK AHMET BEY:

Faik Ahmet Bey started to define his opinions about structural reforms with the new Press Law. Since the beginning of the Republican regime he had declared his support for the adjustment of the laws of the ancien regime and drafting new Republican laws. According to him, this was the strongest element of revolutionary changes³⁰⁰. After a period of trial, The Istanbul newspaper journalists' case was dismissed from the Independence Court and Mustafa Kemal Pasha invited them to Izmir in order to arrange the new regime's relations with the press³⁰¹. On 1 February 1923, *İkdam* Newspaper's owner Ahmet Cevdet, the editorial writer of *Tanin* Newspaper, Hüseyin Cahit, *Tevhid-i Efkar* Newspaper's owner Velid Ebüzziya, *İleri* Newspaper's owner Celal Nuri, the editorial writer of *Akşam* Newspaper Necmeddin Sadak, the editorial writer of *Vakit* Newspaper Mehmet Asım, the editorial writer of *Tercüman-ı Hakikat* newspaper Hüseyin Şükrü, and *Vatan* writer Ahmet Emin Bey were called to Izmir by the Pasha. All of them except Velid Ebüzziya were interviewed with him.

³⁰⁰ Ahmed, Faik, "Kanunlara Dair", *İstikbal*, 16 Ağustos 1339/1923: 988.

³⁰¹ Yalman, Ahmed Emin, *Yakın Tarihte*, 912.

At the same the amendment of the new Press Law was discussed in the Ministry of the Interior and Law. Defaming the Grand Assembly and the President and blessing the prophets and the Caliphate were defined as crimes in the bill. Defaming the army, navy and formal institutions would also be punishable. More measures were taken and Faik Ahmet Bey believed that those measures were very appropriate to the spirit of the new regime. Attempts were made to adjust the Press Law to suit the new policies of the regime. One of the new regime's arrangements for the press was to force the journalists who wanted to print off a newspaper to buy some amount of ethyl alcohol from the cashier's office. That should not occur in any civilised country which was respectful to latitude of thought and freedom of expression, and even a populist regime should never do that. The new Press Law was seen as a necessity for the process of rehabilitation.

But Faik Ahmet Bey mentioned that the new Press Law had to depend on the principle of the freedom of expression. Punishment of defamation was a necessity for a Press Law, but its limits should be defined to prevent the abuse of authority. All Governments like the eulogy and its power and authority is always huge. And they always had the capacity to understand the criticism as an aspersion. This mentality should not be put into the Law.

The majority of the deputies felt indisposed to the criticism of the newspapers and they decided to hold a secret meeting to discuss the matter³⁰². If the new regime wanted to put the idea of the sovereignty of the people from theory into practice, freedom of the Press had to be achieved. The government had to get used to the freedom of criticism and condemnation. Liberty and the freedom of expression were advantageous for the country. Ideas became dangerous when they couldn't find a free outlet.

One of the most significant structural changes in the new regime was the abolition of the institution of Caliphate. After the abolition of the Sultanate it was the second radical change. The debates about that change started while the Sultan's family were forced to emigrate and continued while the changes over the Şeriye and Evkaf Ministry and the new Educational Law took place. During March 1924, demands for

³⁰² Ahmed, Faik, "Matbuat Kanunu", *Istikbal*, 5 Şubat 1340/1924: 1118.

radical changes continued in the Assembly and several proposals about the Caliphate came from different deputies. At the same religious affairs and state affairs was separated from each other by the 429th law code and more radical changes continued. Signs of these changes came during the budget session in the Assembly. One of the radical demands came from the Izmir delegate Saracoğlu Şükrü Bey. During the budget season on 20 February 1924 a discussion about the Ministry of Religious Affairs opened, and Şükrü Bey declared his views about the separation of religion from politics³⁰³. He demanded the total separation of the Ministry from the State authority. According to Şükrü Bey, in a secular state, the Ministry should not belong to the State, and the madrasahs had to be under the control of the Ministry of Education. He was supported by the Saruhan delegate Vasıf Bey, and he also protested against the budget of the Caliph. After these incidents the Siirt delegate and Halil Hulki Efendi and his fifty colleagues presented a bill of complaint to the Assembly for the abrogation of the Institution of the Caliphate and Ministry of Religious Affairs³⁰⁴. There were many different reactions to the proposal and strong debates took place in the Assembly, but the Institution of the Caliphate was abolished³⁰⁵.

Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the abolition of the Caliphate was necessary for the formation of a new regime. And he offered the formation of an independent institution of Caliphate, which he thought would give Turkey a strategic advantage in World politics. From the beginning, Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the demands of Şükrü Bey were going to be accepted by the People's Party. And even though there were significant conservative deputies inside the Party, he was sure that they were not powerful enough to change the Party's decision³⁰⁶. He believed that those deputies could only delay decisions by leaving the discussions taken on the Assembly, or they could leave the Party in the end. And they could agitate the People against the Party and its principles but this would lead to them being exiled.

For Faik Ahmet Bey, Şükrü Bey's demands were appropriate for a secular state. He perceived these reform demands as the formation of totally secular state. If the state

³⁰³ Akgün, Seçil Karal, *Halifeliğin Kaldırılması ve Laiklik 1924-1928* (İstanbul: Temel, 2006) 206-215.

³⁰⁴ Yalman, Ahmed Emin, *Görüp Geçirdiklerim*, 950

³⁰⁵ Akgün Seçil, *Halifeliğin Kaldırılması*, 214.

³⁰⁶ Ahmed, Faik "Vaziyetin Tevazzuhu", *İstikbal*, 3 March 1340/1924:1132.

was separated from religious issues, the Ministry of Religious Affairs would not be bound to the state. According to Faik Ahmet Bey, the Ministry's separation from politics was a felicitous decision but he believed that the Ministry had to belong to the religious community³⁰⁷ as an autonomous institution of the Muslims, headed by the Sheikh-ul Islam, and that the institution of Müftis should be under its control. The Madrasahs and education of the religious ulamma should also belong to the Muslim communities themselves. All religious affairs and religious institutions should be autonomous of politics, state issues and politicians; and the Sheikh ul-Islam's and the ulamma's political power could be broken. They had to be autonomous and run by the community and the state should not be in direct control. So Faik Ahmet Bey proposed a caliphate separate from the government which was independent as an institution. But when the caliphate was totally banned he did not express his views.

As a part of the structural changes, Municipal Reform was also organized. The regime tried to change the Provincial law of 1913 and decided to place municipal administrations under the control of a central organization. The centralization of the municipalities also caused disturbances among the opposition. The Ministry of the Interior demanded an administrative reform plan and opposition emerged in the Assembly. This opposition was mainly regurgitated by the *Vatan* newspaper which announced its opposition to the new regulations, and it was claimed that a central body could not serve local people's needs³⁰⁸. The centre decided to reform the municipalities and bind them to a central state body but for the opposition, this was proof of the government's mistrust of society. The administrators believed that society and the people were incapable of ruling themselves and they were trying to avert their self-sufficiency. The opposition demanded the abandonment of the central administration and wanted the formation of local ones.

After these incidents Faik Ahmet Bey wrote several articles in the newspaper supporting the opposition's views. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the reform plan was going to make the municipal administration much more centralised and the spirit of centralism would spread to the municipalities more; the governor would have more

³⁰⁷ Ahmed, Faik "Bütçe Müzakeresi", *Istikbal*, 29 Şubat 1340/1924; 1130.

³⁰⁸ Yalman, Ahmed Emid, *Yakın Tarihte*, 950.

liberty of action, administration would be reformed, but in the end the municipalities would be under central administration. But Faik Ahmet Bey believed that all these structural changes could fail because centralisation was not the key to better-ruled municipalities. Centralisation only continued the bad management. According to him the real solution was to go along with the real spirit of the Anatolian Revolution; centralisation had to be diminished and self-administration of localities increased³⁰⁹.

According to Faik Ahmet Bey, the country was facing a harsh centralism which conflicted with the Anatolian Revolution. The centralism of the new regime was in effect a reversion to the *ancien regime*. The Sultanate and constitutional monarchy had been abolished because they could not meet the requirements of the modern age and those regimes were also incompatible with the people's sovereignty. But the Anatolian Revolution became deficient because the centralist spirits of the sultanate and constitutional monarchy were still in the minds of the government and the republic therefore became a formal and virtual regime. There was no great difference between the new and old spirit of administration. The same fierce centralism was still on the agenda, but for Faik Ahmet Bey, that was not the real goal of the Anatolian Revolution. The administrative principles of the revolution were set during the 1st National Assembly and it was the self-administration of the municipalities by the people. By achieving it, the people would start to rule themselves and it would be able to take part in the administrative system. He believed that the details of the principle of self-administration had been written by the deputies in the first constitution. The local administration was going to be run by the local municipal councils and the local deputies chosen by the people. People had to join the administration. The social and economic life of localities would thus be in the hands of the local community. The high politics could be left to the deputies of the National Assembly³¹⁰.

After the opening of the new parliamentary session of the Assembly, new discussions emerged, one of which was about the electoral law. Faik Ahmet Bey also showed his hostility to the existing electoral law in his articles. According to him, the electoral law and indirect suffrage were against the spirit of the revolution,

³⁰⁹ Ahmed, Faik, "Belediye Teşkilatı Nasıl Olmalı", *Istikbal*, 26 Haziran 1340/1924: 1220.

³¹⁰ Ahmed, Faik, "Mahalli İdareler Halka Verilmeli", *Istikbal*, 6 Temmuz 1340/1924: 1228.

republicanism and the sovereignty of the people³¹¹. And he mentioned his belief in a new electoral law and electoral system compatible with the new conditions in the country. For Faik Ahmet Bey, the existing electoral system –indirect suffrage –belonged to the sultanate era. Indirect suffrage was a system used in constitutional monarchies or sultanates; it was inappropriate for a republican regime. It was against the principles of a democratic republican regime which defined the people as the sovereign power. So a new law depended on the principle of the sovereignty of the people had to be prepared. The meaning of the principle was the people ruling themselves. It could only be achieved with a new electoral system –direct suffrage–. That was a necessity for him.

According to Faik Ahmet Bey the difference between a sultanate and a republic had to be reflected in every aspect of political life and laws. The people had to be represented accurately in a republican regime. And Faik Ahmet Bey believed that it was impossible to form a democracy with the laws of the old regime. The new regime depended on the people's sovereignty and its rules had to be regulated according to that principle. For him, the elections were a significant part of the development of the sovereignty of the people. He believed that every regime that broke the old system of politics, which depended on divine laws, and gave the sovereignty to the people created jurisprudence according to the necessities of the new regimes. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that indirect suffrage was an electoral system created by the old regimes, and occurred before the revolutions of the sovereignty of the people. It was a method created during the absolutist monarchies in which the right to suffrage depended on the owners of land and wealth. In order to vote, people had to have property or pay a certain amount of tax. But when the nations gradually started to gain their liberty and destroy the institutions which assumed their right of sovereignty, those electoral systems disappeared and a rule of law was created. Democracies were formed with new electoral systems, universal suffrage and direct suffrage³¹². Faik Ahmet Bey commented that the all civilised countries had direct suffrage, and the indirect suffrage was a remnant of the old regime for the Turkish Republic. He believed that the Turkish Revolution had to change the

³¹¹ Ahmed, Faik, "İntihab Kanunu 1", İsikbal, 30 Teşrinievvel 1340/1924: 1322.

³¹² Ahmed, Faik "İntihab Kanunu 2", İstikbal, 1 Teşrinisani 1340/1924: 1323.

indirect suffrage system. The revolution had to abandon the system of the sultanate and create a new one for the regime of the sovereignty of the people and for free citizens.

Faik Ahmet Bey was completely against indirect suffrage. According to him, in that election method a second elector interfered between the people and their representors. This was a frailty for democrac and, those kinds of elections occurred in sultanates. If those second electors were acting according to the wills of the first electors, their interference was unnecessary. If they were acting according to their own wills, that was totally against the people who used their sovereignty during elections. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the deputies were the representatives of the people, and they could only be given that right by the people. If sovereignty was given to the people unconditionally, the second electors and indirect suffrage had to be abolished. The people would not actually be sovereign under that electoral system, and they would take no further interest in elections. Even though the advocates of indirect suffrage argued that the people were not mentally, politically or educationally ready to elect their deputies directly, Faik Ahmet Bey believed that it was a necessity for democracy³¹³.

For Faik Ahmet Bey even direct suffrage wasn't enough for the formation of a real democracy. According to him, the electoral system for democracy was the proportional scale and proportional representation of the political parties in the assembly. He believed that with proportional representation, every party idea and political movement in the country could be represented and the regime would be better based on the sovereignty of the people. Proportional representation was the most civilised and modern method used in Europe and the civilised world and it had to be brought to Turkey. The parliament had to be the ultimate body of the national administration. By applying the majority rule system, the votes and ideas of millions of people never reached the assembly. And in the assembly the decisions was also taken by the majority vote. So, decisions were taken by the minority of the people, not the majority and the decisions of a limited number of people were imposed on the majority. In proportional representation, every delegate of every party was represented on the assembly and that was much more democratic as a multi-party regime could be formed. Faik Ahmet Bey strongly believed that for the sake of the sovereignty of the people, a

³¹³ Ahmed, Faik "İntibah Kanunu 3", Istikbal, 2 Teşrinisani 1340/1924: 1324.

multi-party regime and proportional representation was necessary³¹⁴. According to him, the single-party regime was against the revolution and it was reactionary, coming from above, from the Single-Party, not from the people. The real revolutionaries had to fight against the single-party regime and indirect suffrage and for democracy and a real republican regime.

As well as these changes, Faik Ahmet Bey also proposed the abolition of the foreign institutions. According to him, after the political and cultural reforms an economical reform program had to be prepared. The program had to be about the foreign economical institutions, which were preventing economic progress and the financial independence of the country. The institution of state trading (Reji), and the Public Debtor (Düyun-u Umumiye) had to be abolished³¹⁵. He believed that if this happened the Republican regime would see economic development.

4.2.1. PREPARATION OF THE 1924 CONSTITUTION:

During the declaration of the republican regime, the decision was taken to also declare the new constitution. But the process became prolonged and The Committee of the Constitutional Change continued its duty until the admission of the new constitution on 20 April 1924³¹⁶. Faik Ahmet Bey continued his opposition to the amendment of the constitution during 1924 and criticized the changes made to the draft constitution.

According to the new amendment, the President would elect the Prime Minister and he could elect his cabinet from the assembly. The new cabinet would be submitted for the assembly's approval by the President. With its approval after a vote, the new cabinet would be formed. But according to Faik Ahmet Bey, there was a problem with this process, namely, it was not clear what would happen if the assembly didn't approve the cabinet. Would the whole cabinet be dismissed and a cabinet issue be created, or would the Prime Minister who had been elected by the President be replaced with one approved by the assembly? With this ambiguity, the Prime Minister could transform the

³¹⁴ Ahmed, Faik "Nisbi İntihab Usulü", Istikbal, 4 Teşrinisani 1340/1924: 1326.

³¹⁵ Ahmed, Faik, "Ecnebi Müesseseler", Istikbal, 19 Mart 1340/1924: 1116.

³¹⁶ Aydemir, Ş.S., Tek Adam, 170.

problem into a cabinet issue and ask for a vote of confidence, or the President could nominate another candidate for Prime Minister, who could be approved by assembly³¹⁷.

The Committee opposed the system, on account of this, and requested the cancellation of the Assembly's right of approval of the cabinet and the Prime Minister in the constitution. According to them, the Assembly shouldn't have the right to approve the decision and should not be able to disapprove. The approval of the assembly had to be cancelled. But for Faik Ahmet Bey that was a great mistake. With the exception of the Sultanate, in every regime based on the people's sovereignty, the cabinet had to be approved by the assembly. If this method was dropped, the assembly had to totally accept the principle of the separation of powers, accept the French method and a new cabinet had to read its programme and ask for vote of confidence at the first meeting. The Assembly's duty could be to supervise the programme and the government could be a separate legislative power against the assembly. But, according to Faik Ahmet Bey, the cabinet would have to be approved in any case³¹⁸.

While the constitutional changes were being discussed, two deputies had presented a bill of complaints, which included a draft of bicameralism³¹⁹. Saki and Ali Beys first presented it, and later on Karesi Delegate Süreyya Bey brought up the draft again. Süreyya Bey's draft included that the whole authority and rights had to be performed by the Assembly. And in order to prevent corruption, Süreyya Bey proposed the formation of another assembly which would be elected in general elections. He also proposed a political structure based on two assemblies and two parliaments³²⁰. In his articles, Faik Ahmet Bey strongly supported Süreyya Beys proposals. He saw them as appropriate to the actual needs of the country and in his opinion, the formation of a second assembly was much more appropriate to the principle of sovereignty of the people. There should be two assemblies, elected by the people. Many of the modern European countries had two assemblies and, moreover, two assemblies could prevent the tyranny of assemblies and create a balance of power. An assembly which had large authorities and wide powers would always create domination. And domination by an

³¹⁷ Ahmed, Faik, "Yeni Bir Mesele", *Istikbal*, 24 Kanunısani 1340/1924: 1110.

³¹⁸ Ahmed, Faik, "Yeni Bir Mesele", *Istikbal*, 24 Kanunısani 1340/1924: 1110.

³¹⁹ Tanör, Bülent, *Osmanlı-Türk Anayasal Gelişmeleri*, (İstanbul: YKY, 2004) 292.

³²⁰ Gözübüyük, Şeref, Sezgin, Zekai, *Meclis Görüşmeleri*, 8.

assembly would always be much more dangerous than a personal tyranny. With the formation of two assemblies, inappropriate and detrimental decisions could be avoided. Single assemblies and their decisions would be harmful sometimes, but two assemblies would discourage harmfulness. Reform of the bill of complaints would be much more effective. And with the existence of two assemblies, there would be much more experienced men of letters on the assemblies and they could bring political progress. More appropriate decisions would be taken. Even though Faik Ahmet Bey supported the formation of a second assembly and perceived it as a necessity, he knew that the existing assembly would not want to share its authority³²¹.

After long debates, the Committee set the parliamentary season as six months, elections for every four years and Presidential elections for every seven years. The election of the deputies would be held every four years³²². At the beginning of the discussion of the Committee, Faik Ahmet Bey continued his criticism and again declared that the existing Assembly gained attorneyship of the people for two years and it would be a *fait accompli* to change it to four years without the approval of the people³²³. Faik Ahmet Bey also criticized the period of the parliamentary season. According to him, if the assembly continued to be a grand assembly, which depended on the unity of powers, and continued to have regular meetings, it could not be declared that the parliamentary season was for six months and the rest of the year holiday. If the executive body continued to be the Assembly and the cabinet should continue to take orders from the Assembly, the actual government was the Assembly and the holiday was meaningless. Unless the separation of powers was accepted, the holiday and election of the assembly for four years should not be permitted. A two year Parliamentary season should be applied in order to prevent the over domination of the Assembly, which had extraordinary authorities, and to more often consult the people, who were the real owners of the sovereignty. If those changes were made, Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the principle of the separation of powers had to be achieved.

When it was understood that the new constitution brought the separation of powers, he continued to criticize the position given to the Assembly. The new

³²¹ Ahmed, Faik, "İki Meclis", *Istikbal*, 15 Kanunısani 1340/1294: 1104.

³²² Gözübüyük, Şeref, Sezgin, Zekai, Meclis Görüşmeleri, 8.

³²³ Ahmed, Faik, "Müddet Meselesi", *Istikbal*, 8 Şubat 1340/1924: 1119.

constitution created a new order with the principle of the separation of the powers. The new principle reduced the Assembly to the level of an ordinary parliament and the united executive and legislative power under the old assembly was abolished. The old constitution gave unlimited authority to the assembly, and no other authorities were recognized. The executive, legislature and judiciary and the Presidency of the state were under the authority of the Assembly. But the whole essence of the new constitutional project was to reduce the power of the Assembly and to administer the President's powers with the rights to veto the laws and to dismiss the Assembly³²⁴.

Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the new constitution had to be submitted for the people's affirmation through a referendum and that this was the right of the people. The existing Assembly was elected according to the Kanun-u Esasi, and it was not like the previous revolutionary Assembly³²⁵. A referendum was a necessity for it. And according to him the Assembly should not have the right to make amendments to the constitution that could damage the state structure. A Constitution was the basis of society and the state. Because of its significance, the people, as the beneficiaries of the rule of law, had to affirm the new law. Submitting an important decision to the affirmation of the people was a significant part of modern democracies³²⁶. During the convention times in France the people affirmed the constitution. In America, Switzerland and England the people, through referendums, affirmed every law and constitution and the people took part in every process of decision-making. Without the vote of the people no decision was taken. For Turkey's new constitution a referendum had to be made to obtain the people's approval. In this way, public opinion would be understood and the regime could prove its respect for the sovereignty of the people. If the referendum was not carried out and a fast decision was made, discontent with the new constitution would grow and attempts to change the constitution in the near future would be made. A referendum was a must for a permanent constitution under which a more powerful Assembly and state structure could be formed.

³²⁴ Ahmed, Faik, "Kanun-ı Esasi ve Tasdik-i Amme", *Istikbal*, 21 Şubat 1340/1924: 1123.

³²⁵ Ahmed, Faik, "Kanun-ı Esasi ve Tasdik-i Amme", *Istikbal*, 21 Şubat 1340/1924: 1123.

³²⁶ Ahmed, Faik, "Müddet Meselesi", *Istikbal*, 8 Şubat 1340/1924: 1119.

4.2.2. 1924 CONSTITUTIONAL DEBATES IN THE ASSEMBLY:

After long debates in the Committee, the new draft of the constitution was sent to the Assembly on 9 March 1924³²⁷ and began to be discussed article by article. From 9 March 1924 to 20 April 1924 a meeting was held once a week in the Assembly in order to discuss the draft. Each law needed a two-thirds majority vote to be accepted. Debates and heated discussion took place in the Assembly and many of the articles met with strong opposition³²⁸.

Even though the opposition groups of the First Assembly were liquidated after the 1923 Elections, the constitutional debates had been a period of revival for the opposition movement and a new opposition group joined together and support for Ismet Pasha declined. But in the end the opposition was forced to give a vote of confidence to the draft without any changes³²⁹.

The opposition movement strongly followed the principle of the sovereignty of the people and acted against any violatory proposals by Committee. They rejected the extraordinary authority given to the President and supported the superiority of the Assembly over any other power. In particular, the President's right to dismiss the assembly was criticised, the elections were a part of the people's sovereignty. The Karesi deputy Süreyya Bey also rejected the renewal of the Presidential elections every seven years, believing that the President should be elected for four years. Saruhan deputy Abidin Bey rejected the President's right to veto the laws declared by the Assembly. İzmir deputy Seyit Bey showed his hostility to the immunity from arrest given to the deputies, Kütahya deputy Recep Bey refused the President's leadership of the general staff. According to the Dersim deputy Lütfi Fikri Bey, the right to interpret the laws had to belong to the Assembly. In order to protect the superiority of the Assembly, the principle of the unity of powers was supported against the separation of powers³³⁰.

³²⁷ Akın, Rıdvan, TBMM Devleti, 274.

³²⁸ Smith, E. "Debates on Turkish Constitution of 1924", *Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi* 3 (Eylül 1958): 82-106.

³²⁹ Tunçay, Mete, Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nde Tek Parti Yönetimi, 105.

³³⁰ Smith, E. Debates on Turkish Constitution, 85-97.

Faik Ahmet Bey followed the decisions from the beginning and he wrote critical articles about the debates. Together with that he strongly supported the discussions in the Assembly which were, according to him, the only way to ensure sovereignty of the people. He criticised the Party's demands to conceal the debates at Party meetings. According to him, the only place the Constitution could be debated was the Assembly³³¹ and until now it had approved every decision of the Party without any real debate. Without the strict control of the People's Party, high caliber debates could be held at the public session of the Assembly. With that freedom of expression, deputies could support their ideas without any intervention³³² and the people could plainly see the opinions of the deputies and could see the reasons behind opposition to and support for the articles. Faik Ahmet Bey also, however, strongly criticised the new draft Constitution in his newspaper articles. According to Faik Ahmet Bey, the new constitution was very different from the older *Teşkilat-ı Esasiye* Law. Because the old constitution could not be totally abrogated, the Committee blended in new articles. Both the principle of the unity of powers and that of the separation of powers were found in the same constitution³³³. This was the main weakness of the draft. In theory, the old constitution's principal of the unity of powers added to the new one: "all powers are gathered in the Assembly, the Assembly has the authority to run the executive and legislative powers". But underneath this, it was also declared that the Assembly and the elected deputies could not exercise executive powers and that the Assembly transfers its powers to the elected President. The separation of powers was therefore only theoretical and in reality the powers were gathered under the President's authority. It was also declared that there couldn't be any attorneyship on legislative powers and written that the Assembly had absolute authority over them. But along with that, the right to veto and withdraw laws was given to the President who also had the right to dissolve the Assembly. The right belonged to the Assembly, but a President, elected by the Assembly itself, used it. According to Faik Ahmet Bey, it was unclear in the draft which was the superior authority: the President or the Assembly.

³³¹ Ahmed, Faik, "Yine Teşkilat-ı Esasiye", *Istikbal*, 17 Mart 1340/1924: 1144.

³³² Ahmed, Faik, "Hükümet Teşkilatı", *Istikbal*, 6 Mart 1340/1924: 1135.

³³³ Ahmed, Faik, "Teşkilat-ı Esasiye", *Istikbal*, 10 Mart 1340/1924: 1138.

The powers given to the President were also discussed in the Assembly and many deputies opposed the President's excess of authority³³⁴. The Committee made excuses by mentioning the republican models of the world, saying that, except America and Switzerland, all countries gave those powers to the President. But Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the existing draft constitution was eclectic. Some parts of the Swiss Constitution's unity of powers principle were taken and harmonized with the French Constitution's separation of powers. But Turkey's system was not appropriate for these authorities to be given to the President. The President of Turkey was also the head of the ruling party, and the head of the party should not be involved in State business. The French President had the right to dissolve the Assembly, but he was not the leader of the ruling party, he was the leader of the whole nation. And there was also a balancing Senate³³⁵.

During the debates in the Assembly, the President's rights and authority were also highly criticised. Starting from the first meeting, deputies showed their hostility to the authority given to the President, especially the President's right to veto and dissolve the assembly³³⁶. But the strongest criticism was for the 25th article, which gave the president the right to renew the general elections³³⁷. The most heated debates about the sovereignty of the people occurred during the discussions of this article. A clash of powers occurred between the deputies and the assembly split between the supporters and opponents of the article. The Committee generally supported the article. The opposing voices increased and even the head of the Committee of the Amendment of the Constitution, Yunus Nadi Bey, wrote an article in the Anadolu'da Yeni Gün newspaper stating his discomfort with the opponents of the article³³⁸.

From the beginning Faik Ahmet Bey supported and encouraged every opposition to Presidential rights in the assembly and he strongly criticised every demand to reduce the Assembly's authority. According to him, these demands were against the general spirit of the national revolution. And he defined the supporters and the opponents of the

³³⁴ Şeref Gözübüyük, Zekai Sezgin, 1924 Anayasası Hakkındaki Meclis Görüşmeleri, (Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi, 1957) 321-349.

³³⁵ Ahmed, Faik, "Teşkilat-ı Esasiye", İstikbal, 10 Mart 1340/1924: 1138.

³³⁶ Akın, Rıdvan, TBMM Devleti (1920-1923), (İstanbul: İletişim, 2001) 270-293.

³³⁷ Gözübüyük, Şeref, Sezgin, Zekai, Meclis Görüşmeleri, 179-216.

³³⁸ Akın, Rıdvan, TBMM Devleti, 313.

presidential rights as two sides of an ongoing fight. The supporters were those attempting to reduce the Assembly to a simple parliament with limited powers and to give the all the authority to the President. They wanted the introduction of the right to dissolve the Assembly as a punishment for opposing the government³³⁹. It was a weapon to be used against an Assembly which diverged from the government and became closer to the people. The right to veto was not the real method used to prevent erroneous decisions in the assembly. With that right the President would have excessive authority over the assembly and Faik Ahmet Bey showed his hostility to the assembly's four electoral years as it would not affect the excessive Presidential powers. He repeated his criticism. He commented that the existing assembly was elected for two electoral years and the people gave their approval for it³⁴⁰. The people's rights had been abused and their will ignored. The people elected the deputies for two years. From now on, the Assembly could arbitrarily increase its period of service for its own ends. These kinds of changes were opening the way to the despotism of the assembly. Faik Ahmet Bey continued his critical attitude by criticising the President's new right to demand a new election. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that together with the right to veto, the President's powers were excessive. The article was eventually rejected in the Assembly by a general ballot.

Faik Ahmet Bey believed that equality between the two sides could only be achieved when a second assembly was formed and separation of powers could be achieved. And at that time the President had to disengage from the Assembly and the party and truly return to his regulatory and governing duties³⁴¹ otherwise the 25th article could be a return to the despotism of the unity of powers and the right to veto could be used as a strategic weapon against the Assembly. Only assemblies subservient to the government would not interfere in any veto and, according to him, the right to veto had caused corruption since the Second Constitutional Monarchy Period.

After the rejection of the 25th article for the second time, the Assembly continued its meetings and fourteen new articles were accepted. But problems started to

³³⁹ Ahmed, Faik, "Yine Teşkilat-ı Esasiye", *Istikbal*, 17 Mart 1340/1924: 1144.

³⁴⁰ Ahmed, Faik, "Dört Sene", *Istikbal*, 18 Mart 1340/1924: 1145.

³⁴¹ Ahmed, Faik, "Fesih Meselesi", *Istikbal*, 25 Mart 1340/1924: 1150.

re-emerge over the 26th article, which determined the duties of the legislative power³⁴². Thanks to the efforts of the deputies, the President's term of office, which was declared for seven years on the draft, was decreased to four years. The Committee's demand was to set the President's election for every seven years, but with the opposition of the deputies, it was reduced to four years. According to Faik Ahmet Bey, the opposition's effort was more than justified. The Assembly elected the President, and the Assembly's term of office was for four years, so the President's term should be the same. Anything else could be unlawful. The real representative of the people was the Assembly, and it was only giving the executive power to the President, who was elected by it. The president was using the executive power in the name of the Assembly. Under these circumstances, the President had to remain in office within the limit of the parliamentary season, and a new one had to be elected with the formation of a new Assembly. On the other hand, if the old president stayed in power and used the authority given by the old assembly, when the new one was formed it would be incompatible with the sovereignty of the people and the Assembly. A new Assembly couldn't give its attorneyship to a President elected by the old Assembly. The Turkish Presidential system wasn't like the American or the French one. In the American system, the people directly elected the president, and in France he was elected by the court lodge and the parliament. In the Turkish model it would be inappropriate to give the President a longer official term than the parliament³⁴³.

The President's right to veto changed as a result of the efforts of the deputies³⁴⁴ and the exercise of his veto right was reduced from one month, which was the Committee's demand, to ten days as demanded by the deputies. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the change in the right to veto did not violate the authority of the assembly. With the change, the President could use his veto right in ten days, and if the rejected law could be passed in the same way in the assembly with a vote of majority again, it had to be accepted without any change.

Faik Ahmet Bey welcomed the Assembly's protection of its authority. According to him the Assembly had resisted the demands for superior presidential

³⁴² Çakan, Işıl, *Türk Parlamento Tarihi*, 175.

³⁴³ Ahmed, Faik "14. Madde", *İsitkbal*, 2 Nisan 1340/1924: 1157.

³⁴⁴ Akın, Rıdvan, *TBMM Devleti*, 352-358.

authority. The assembly vindicated itself on the right to veto and the renewal of elections, and with its opposition to the bills, the structure of the Constitution changed. The Assembly had to discuss the laws, the President was forced to respect to the sovereignty of the people and the control of the Assembly was vested in the President of the Assembly³⁴⁵. The Assembly then started to discuss the liability of the President to the Assembly. According to the 41st article of the draft,³⁴⁶ the President was liable to the assembly only when high treason occurred. And, according to the 39th article of the draft, the President's decisions were signed by the Prime Minister and the relevant Minister³⁴⁷. According to Faik Ahmet Bey, by doing that the president's political liability was limited and real liability lay with the Prime Minister and the Minister concerned. With their signature, the President had no political liability in the assembly. But Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the president should not be absolved from responsibility and should not benefit from immunity. A code of punishment on Presidential crimes had to be included in the constitution. Only emperors and monarchs were immune from punishment - all the presidents of the modern world are bound by laws. The President shouldn't have exclusion of liability and political immunity. His authority had to be legal. The presidents had political immunity because they did not actually perform any political action and the performance of the political execution was left to the ministers and the deputies. But in the Turkish system, the president was active in the performance of the political execution and so had to be liable for his actions³⁴⁸. Faik Ahmet Bey also criticised the 40th article of the prepared Constitution, which confirmed the President as Commander in Chief of the army³⁴⁹. According to him, giving this authority to the President together with political immunity was unacceptable. Under his political immunity, the President would have great authority. The Committee gave the right to execute laws to the Assembly, but on the other hand the President was the supreme Commander and he had political immunity. Faik Ahmet

³⁴⁵ Ahmed, Faik, "14. Madde", *Istikbal*, 2 Nisan 1340/1924: 1157.

³⁴⁶ Faik Ahmet Bey mentioned the article as the 42nd (*Istikbal*, 3 Nisan 1340/1924: 1158), but the article mentioned by him was the article was 41st (Akın, Rıdvan, TBMM Devleti, 364).

³⁴⁷ Parla, Taha, *Türkiye'de Anayasalar*, (İstanbul: İletişim, 2002) 24.

³⁴⁸ Ahmed, Faik, "Mesuliyete Dair", *Istikbal*, 3 Nisan 1339/1924: 1158.

³⁴⁹ Faik Ahmet Bey mentioned it as the 41st article (*Istikbal*, 3 Nisan 1339/1924: 1158), but in reality it was 40th (Çakan, Işıl, *Türk Parlamento Tarihi*, 179).

Bey believed that this situation was a real problem, but the efforts of the deputies allowed this article to also be changed³⁵⁰.

He continued to declare his opposition to the 86th article³⁵¹. The right to declare martial law was given to the government by this article. If the government could see signs of a war or insurrection, it could declare martial law. The government could declare it by itself if the assembly wasn't prepared, and it could be applied for a month. With the declaration of the martial law, the government would also control the free press, the free societies, residences and enterprises. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that under martial law, the government would have the right to rule the country with a high hand³⁵². The government had unacceptably wide-reaching authority and could abuse the law by using the excuse of a threat of war or insurrection and make these rights permanent, or even try to control the assembly. He believed that martial law should only be declared when an "actual" war or insurrection was happening and it could not be declared when the government saw a menace³⁵³. That could be an arbitrary power in the hands of the government because 'menace' was not defined in the article. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that personal liberties should be reduced in times of war, but actions had to be controlled and checked by the assembly. The assembly had to be included as supervising body to the article. Even if martial law could be declared for a month, that was not enough to control the government. If the assembly was not in session, the law could be in force for months. The government had to give an account of the martial law period to the assembly. The incidents which gave rise to the declaration had to be strictly defined in the articles, and the Assembly had to approve it whether in parliamentary session or not. If the Assembly was in recess it should hold an extraordinary meeting. For Faik Ahmet Bey, it was obvious that the article was against the sovereignty of the people and with those changes the law could fit in with the sovereignty of the people and its arbitrariness could be reduced. And he believed, for the sovereignty of the people, the right to declare martial law should be granted to the assembly by virtue of its superiority.

³⁵⁰ Ahmed, Faik, "Mesuliyete Dair", *Istikbal*, 3 Nisan 1340/1924: 1158.

³⁵¹ In his article it was written as the 88th article (*Istikbal*, 8 Nisan 1339/1924: 1162), but it was 86th article of the draft (Akin, Ridvan, TBMM Devleti, 366).

³⁵² Ahmed, Faik, "40, 88nci Maddeler", *Istikbal*, 8 Nisan 1340/1924: 1162.

³⁵³ Ahmed, Faik, "Yine 88nci Madde", *Istikbal*, 9 Nisan 1340/1924: 1163.

According to him all these presidential laws prepared by the Committee were contrary to the general spirit of the Assembly. All these laws were aimed at giving the President a superior position and it was done without regard for the Assembly's reaction. All these laws were against the Assemblies' sovereignty, and, therefore, all these laws were changed by resistance from the deputies. Under pressure from the Assembly, the Committee was forced to reform the articles.

He also, however, criticised any excess of authority given to the Assembly. Faik Ahmet Bey maintained that, in combination with a personnel tyranny, a potent assembly could also create a despotic regime. In the single chamber system, if there were no balancing power to control the other authority, increasing the President's or the assembly's rights could create a personal or institutional tyranny. So, the best alternative was to create a system dependent on the balance of power, and that could only occur when the unicameral system was abandoned³⁵⁴. He believed that unicameralism had no place in the modern world and that it should only be used during revolutionary times (France was the best example of it). So, the political regime had to adapt to the modern criteria. The period of the public holiday of the assembly was also perceived as a problematic article by Faik Ahmet Bey. According to the regulations, the Assembly started its holiday in April, and ended it in November. The holiday was set for 6 months. He also asked for a shorter period of holiday for the assembly. He believed that the recess would only be justified and legitimate when there was a separation of powers, and without separation of powers, it brought the system to a standstill³⁵⁵.

Faik Ahmet Bey also connoted his suspicions about the end of the discussions in the Assembly. He believed that, the opposition displayed its power during the discussion. The 25th article and the veto right, in particular, were troublesome. Supporters of the government had a plan to block the changes which had been enacted through the will of the opposition. According to Faik Ahmet Bey, the supporters of the government would not take part in the final polling of the constitutional draft so the

³⁵⁴ Ahmed, Faik, "Bugünkü Müzakere", *Istikbal*, 23 Mart 1340/1924: 1148.

³⁵⁵ Ahmed, Faik, "Meclis'in Tatili", *Istikbal*, 10 Nisan 1340/1924: 1164.

qualified majority would be impossible and the draft would be rejected³⁵⁶. And within that, they were going to declare the Assembly as nonfunctional and ask for the renewing of the general elections and the withdrawal of the draft. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that all plans were trying to punish the Assembly and its opposition.

4.2.3 POLITICAL CHANGES AFTER THE 1924 CONSTITUTION AND FAIK AHMET BEY'S VIEWS:

Four months after the declaration of the republic, the first republican government encountered serious crises and resignations and changes occurred. Resignations from the First Republican Government occurred and the Ismet Pasha Cabinet ended after the resignation. . From the beginning of the resignations Faik Ahmet Bey was sure that a wave of problems was coming and in the end a cabinet crisis would occur. The resignation of three important ministers was a sign of hostility to Ismet Pasha. According to Faik Ahmet Bey, Ismet Pasha promised many things to the Assembly but he only steered a middle course and ruled the country with a makeshift – *Idare-i maslahat*³⁵⁷. So nothing changed under his rule and his government's administration was same as the previous governments. Faik Ahmet Bey also believed that Ismet Pasha had lost his prestige in the Party and the Assembly. Significant incidents occurred and Ismet Pasha lost his ascendancy over his friends in the Party. His pressure over the Rauf Orbay incident, and his will to extend the authority of the Court of Independence met with strong opposition; he retracted his proposal of the courts with seventy nine rejection votes against eighty three acceptance. That was a kind of referendum on the Pasha's cabinet and he only just rescued the situation. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that in order to actualize the offer Pasha forced his cabinet members to vote like deputies and he also voted on the same way. Among two hundred and eighty deputies on the Assembly Ismet Pasha was supported by only eighty deputies. That was proof of the weakness of his support; and he should have dismissed the cabinet for a better-supported one. But the Pasha ignored the situation.

³⁵⁶ Ahmed, Faik, "Sonraki Müşkület", *Istikbal*, 13 Nisan 1340/1924: 1166.

³⁵⁷ Ahmed, Faik, "Kabine'nin Mevkii", *Istikbal*, 24 Kanunievvel 1338/1923: 1090.

Resignations started with the Minister of Finance Hasan Fehmi Bey on 31 December 1923³⁵⁸ and continued with the resignation of the Minister of Public Works Ahmet Muhtar Bey on 19 January 1924. Faik Ahmet Bey perceived the resignations as very normal, as he knew of the crisis in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet. He focused on Ahmet Muhtar Bey and criticised the government. Deputies in the Assembly showed their hostility to the Government's Anatolian railways policy and Ahmet Muhtar Bey supported the Government. He showed his hostility to the opponent deputies and he couldn't get any support from the Party. But, with the rising hostility, he was forced to resign after the general ballot by the Assembly when the policy was rejected. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the rejection was of the whole cabinet's policy, not only to Minister of Public Works Ahmet Muhtar Bey.

After the resignations, the cabinet crisis continued and in the end Ismet Pasha dismissed the government. On 6 March 1924 the Pasha formed a Government for the second time³⁵⁹ and some of the cabinet ministers were dismissed and the government refined³⁶⁰. Many people believed that Ismet Pasha was going to form a homogenous specialized cabinet but for Faik Ahmet Bey the refinement of the cabinet was an insignificant event³⁶¹. He didn't see any significant change in the cabinet, only a minor modification. The Minister of the Judiciary Seyit Bey and The Minister of Education were replaced. Those two ministers were sacrificed by Ismet Pasha in order to silence Assembly's reaction to the Government. But Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the soul of the new Government was unchanged and so, for him, no great transformation had occurred. Ismet Pasha was going to continue the Government with his full authority, and that was indeed the Pasha's role; he formed those governments in order to push through the revolutionary changes. It was not a specialized government, it was a revolutionary one created for struggle.

After these events, the Constitution was accepted and the Assembly recessed. The last meeting for the acceptance of the new constitution gathered on 20 April

³⁵⁸ Tunçay, Mete, Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nde Tek Parti Yönetimi, 99.

³⁵⁹ Tunçay, Mete, Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nde Tek Parti Yönetimi, 101.

³⁶⁰ For the list of the changes see Tunçay, Mete, Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nde Tek Parti Yönetimi, 101.

³⁶¹ Ahmed, Faik, "Kabinenin Tasfiyesi", *Istikbal*, 7 Mart 1340/1924: 1136.

1924³⁶². The rest of the fifty-four articles, one changed article, and permanent articles were accepted and discussed at this single meeting and the new constitution, which consisted of one hundred and five general articles and one permanent article, was accepted by a general vote. Faik Ahmet Bey announced his unease with the hurried acceptance of the articles. According to him, the most important part of the discussions was left to the end and the accepted articles were read in hurry and not really discussed³⁶³. He did not accept that the fifty-four articles could be accepted by a single day's discussion.

Later on Faik Ahmet Bey continued to mention his general views on the new constitution. He believed that a scientific constitution should always be ready for new amendments to cover new necessities, but the new constitution was far from that reality. It was mainly accepted in order to have a prepared constitution for the new regime. But constitutions had to be prepared in a serious way. With the bustle of its preparation, the new constitution had serious incoherences and many conflicting articles. He believed that these articles would therefore have to be redrafted in the near future.

The main problem with the constitution, however, was the ambiguity of the new regime. The structure of the regime coming with the new constitution was neither separation of power, nor unity of powers. It was mainly a constitution prepared during the struggle between the two groups in the Assembly: the supporters of the separation of the powers and the supporters of the President's authority. The constitution was therefore eclectic in its essence and this would give rise to problems. Some parts of the constitution were written according to the will of the one group and the rest of it according to the other group's will, so it was a constitution which included the demands of two conflicting groups. The supporters of the Presidential authority found it deficient because the right of cancellation was not given to the President, and the other group also considered it imperfect. For Faik Ahmet Bey, from the very beginning the constitution was problematical and he believed that in the near future the constitution conflict would continue.

³⁶² Akın, Rıdvan, TBMM Devleti, 366.

³⁶³ Ahmed, Faik, "Saliya Tatil", *Istikbal*, 21 Nisan 1340/1924: 1172.

The Assembly decided to end its session on 22 April 1924³⁶⁴ and a six-month holiday period was decided by a general vote. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the six-month holiday for the assembly was a great mistake. It was totally against the authority of the Assembly, and it was done in order to reduce its power. The Assembly held the executive and legislative powers, and spending six months on holiday was just too much. It was against the principles of law and sovereignty of the people³⁶⁵. The government didn't have the right to rule the country by itself. Along with the government, the assembly always had to be in meeting. It was a must for the unity of powers. But in actual fact, there were attempts to ban the Assembly and the government would try to make changes by itself. Attempts were even made to allow the government to enact legislation without the assembly. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that all these incidents were strongly against the new revolution. Public opinion and the people were struck a blow. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the Assembly was moved from İstanbul to Ankara to receive these extraordinary authorities. That was why Ankara was chosen; if the assembly had stayed in İstanbul, such events could not have occurred in such a way³⁶⁶.

At the same time, elections of the Administrative Council of the People's Party were held and a wave of opposition came from various Party deputies. The 25th article was rejected in the Assembly with the efforts of the opposition. Furthermore, during the elections of the Administrative Council of the Republican People's Party, the candidates nominated by the centre of the Party failed to be elected³⁶⁷. There was an ongoing struggle inside the Party. Both of these events were perceived by Faik Ahmet Bey as the success of the opposition group over the Assembly and the Party. He believed that the two groups, consisting of the opposition and promoters of the new policies, were in conflict with many of the changes. But with these two incidents, the opposition's power became irrefutable. It was a signal of the breakdown in the Party's strict discipline and Faik Ahmet Bey believed that, with the unnatural fallacy on which it was based, the Party would collapse.

³⁶⁴ Akın, Rıdvan, TBMM Devleti, 367.

³⁶⁵ Ahmed, Faik, "Saliya Tatil", *Istikbal*, 21 Nisan 1340/1924: 1172.

³⁶⁶ Ahmed, Faik, "Mebusların Dönüşü", *Istikbal*, 25 Nisan 1340/1924: 1175.

³⁶⁷ Tunçay, Mete, Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nde Tek Parti Yönetimi, 95.

He believed that these rejections by its members showed that material powers and strict discipline alone could not hold a party together. More importantly, a party had to be united under a general programme in which common thoughts were set down. Gathering a common body united under the Assembly and ruling it under the directions of the Party director could not guarantee form a strong party structure. Moreover, the existing structure of the party was fragile because domination and discipline could only increase negative reactions inside the party. Within rising conflicts and hostility from its members, the party directors' authority could wane and one day the centre's candidates would be unelectable, paving the way to the destruction of the Party. The directors, who ignored the majority of its members, could try to form another organization. It was obvious that the Party was heading in that direction. When the centre's deputies couldn't get elected to the Administrative Council of the Party, and the President's right to dissolve the assembly was not accepted, the directors saw their authority declining. The same event occurred when the Ismet Pasha cabinet could not secure a vote of confidence in the Party. That rejection was more to do with some of the persons in his cabinet more than Ismet Pasha's personality.

Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the oppositions' success in gaining control over the Administrative Council of the Party and their rejection of the President's right to dissolve was a sign of a new counterbalance power coming onto the scene and the Party's reaction to it was ambiguous. But Faik Ahmet Bey believed that in the near future many of the opponents were going to be excluded, and a new structure would be created from the supporters. The first Mudafaa-i Hukuk group was formed in the 1st Assembly on that way³⁶⁸.

During those incidents an early resignation from the People's Party occurred. Miralay Halid Bey resigned and Faik Ahmet Bey responded to the resignation in his articles. The structural changes in the regime brought conflicts inside the People's Party and opponent views and hostilities started to emerge. One of them came from the National Independence War commander and Kastamonu deputy Miralay Halid Bey. Halid Bey resigned from the People's Party after the debates over the abolition of the Caliphate. He defined himself as a supporter of the populist ideology and the

³⁶⁸ Ahmed, Faik, "İki Hadise", *Istikbal*, 26 Mat 1340/1924: 1151.

revolutions. But he also maintained that he was against the policies of the People's Party. He offered his resignation to the Party³⁶⁹.

Faik Ahmet Bey described the deputy as a conservative one and he opined that other conservative deputies should also resign. According to him, more than being a single resignation, the incident was a result of a structural problem on the Party. The People's Party was far from being homogenous and harmonious. The Party consisted of different groups with various ideologies; so many different parties could flourish from within the Party. It was an unnatural situation which became evident at the Party meetings. Like the struggle of different parties in the parliament, the People's Party itself had internal conflicts.

According to Faik Ahmet Bey, this was proof of the lack of actual political parties in Turkey. Turkish Parties were not formed according to political ideas, ideologies or principles. They were organizations formed to make the people to accept one leader's thought and ideas. Because of that, Turkish parties were parties of power and force, and their ultimate programme was to maintain their authority. Any party was open to any political ideology; a socialist, a liberal, a conservative and a nationalist could come together in a single party³⁷⁰. But for Faik Ahmet Bey, the real meaning of a party was totally different - a party had to get together under principles and a political programme. They had to respect other parties in order for parliamentary life to function and they had to be harmonious and homogenous.

Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the People's Party had to organize in that way. A liberal and a conservative should not come together in a single party. When different ideologies came together in a party, conflicts would always occur. The People's Party had to write a political programme, gather principles and re-organize itself. Under the present structure, the party was in a weak position. More than a party it was like a mass of deputies. Every political ideology inside the People's Party should form their own party and then a Turkish parliamentary system with multiple parties could be achieved. A ruling party and opposition parties could form a regime of checks and balances. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the single party was a necessity of the independence war in

³⁶⁹ Tunçay, Mete, Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nde Tek Parti Yönetimi, 106.

³⁷⁰ Ahmed, Faik "Fırkadan İtiraklar", Istikbal, 11 Mart 1340/1924: 1139.

order to supply national unity, but during Republican times various ideologies had to form their own parties.

4.3. THE NEW POLITICAL REGIME AFTER THE 1924 CONSTITUTION:

4.3.1. AGGRESSION OVER RAUF BEY AND RAFET PASHA

After the end of the discussion of the constitution, a wave of criticism began against Rauf Bey and Refet Pasha, who were on the moderate wing of the People's Party. This started the process of the alienation of the leaders who would form the Progressive Republican Party in the future. The attacks against Refet Pasha, who was the President of the Assembly at that time, were actually started by the ministerialist newspapers of *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* of Ankara and *Cumhuriyet* of İstanbul³⁷¹. Refet Pasha was accused of being unprincipled and politico and also accused over a secret telegram sent by the Minister of the Interior to Ferit (Tek) Bey five years before during the Damat Ferit Pasha Cabinet. In those days, Ferit Bey was the Minister of Public Works and Refet Pasha was the commander of the Samsun troops. The telegram was about Mustafa Pasha's return to Istanbul from Anatolia by the will of the British and ending the opposition to the British troops. Rauf Bey was also attacked because of his comments after the declaration of the Republic. Rauf Bey, Ali Fuat Pasha, and Kazım Karabekir were accused of being unionists who demanded the formation of a regime under their own leadership. But according to Cebesoy, the attacks were mainly for two reasons; first to depreciate their roles in the national struggle, and secondly to show them as reactionary against the revolutionary changes. Refet Pasha, Kazım Karabekir and Ali Fuat Cebesoy were also uncomfortable with the attacks. Rauf Bey was also criticised because of his statements published in the Istanbul Newspapers before the declaration of the Republican regime.

³⁷¹ Zürcher, E.J., *The Progressive Republican Party*, 39.

After these attacks, Refet Pasha resigned as chairman of İstanbul delegates³⁷². Faik Ahmet Bey mentioned his great role during the national struggle. According to him, a great leader of that era couldn't withdraw to his ivory tower. As well as him, the other important leaders of the Anatolian movement were also in question. For Faik Ahmet Bey, the main reason behind this was hostility to those leaders who actually started the patriotic national struggle, while the other ones, who stole the movement from and declared themselves as the founders of the movement and the peace, were still in İstanbul³⁷³. And now the real founders of the national struggle were being questioned. And together with that, there was a rising partisanship for administering the country. Capabilities and specialization were no longer important in politics: now partisanship and loyalty was paramount. An elite circle was trying to gain control of the whole country and trying to eliminate other powers. That circle was trying to take political power from the hands of the people and wanted to form a regime of patronage. They were against any power which could check their authority³⁷⁴. Due to this patronage, incapable people started to rule the country, and thus, an unqualified man like Ferit Bey could become Minister of the Interior. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that under these conditions no progress could be made.

In his defence against the accusations regarding the secret telegram, Refet Pasha made statements to several newspapers. He mentioned that his only aim was to unite the ruling body of the country and declared that from now on he would only try to unite the old war colleagues Mustafa Kemal Pasha, Rauf Bey, Ali Fuat Cebesoy and Kazım Karabekir. But, this time he was accused by the government and told that he was trying to form a military junta regime in Turkey like the one in China³⁷⁵. According to Faik Ahmet Bey, the Ankara newspapers were supporting Ferit Bey, while the İstanbul newspapers supported Refet Pasha. He mentioned that Ferit Bey was especially supported by the *Hakimiyeti-i Milliye* newspaper of Ankara³⁷⁶. The newspaper acted as his advocate and claimed that the telegram was an old incident and Ferit Bey was a

³⁷² Cebesoy, Ali Fuat, *Siyasi Ahtralar*, 489-492.

³⁷³ It is obvious that the other ones mentioned here were the Mustafa Kemal Pasha and his friends. (Ahmed, Faik, "Mebusluktan İstifa", *İstikbal*, 5 Mayıs 1340/1924: 1182).

³⁷⁴ Ahmed, Faik, "Mebusluktan İstifa", *İstikbal*, 5 Mayıs 1340/1924: 1182.

³⁷⁵ Zürcher, E.J., *The Progressive Republican Party*, 39.

³⁷⁶ Ahmed, Faik, "Muvaffakiyet Nerede?", *İstikbal*, 12 Mayıs 1340/1924: 1184.

successful Minister of the Interior. But for Faik Ahmet Bey, Ferit Bey's political position was over and the secret telegram incident had reduced his credibility to zero. He was however supported by the Ankara newspapers, because for İsmet Pasha, his political position was much more important than public opinion. İsmet Pasha did not want him to resign from his chair of Minister of the Interior.

Faik Ahmet Bey approved of Refet Pasha's statement that the state powers had to be reconciled to and united with each other. Faik Ahmet Bey also thought that Mustafa Kemal Pasha and his colleagues had to be united and come into power again. And Refet Pasha was also right when he said that the people who had gained positions in government thanks to internal conflicts had to be eliminated from politics in order to bring back unity. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that this clique was very powerful and would always threaten unity³⁷⁷.

4.3.2. THE COUNCIL OF THE PEOPLE'S PARTY:

During the summer of 1924, the People's Party started a new wave of organization. Its main aim was to go beyond the Party of an Assembly group, and to organize on a nationwide basis³⁷⁸. It was started by sending deputies to the local districts, and later on, the deputies were asked by the Party to return to the center. A council of the Party was convened at the same time.

Faik Ahmet Bey was highly doubtful about this council. According to him, the gathering of the council was exceptional and it was done during the Assembly recess. It was exceptional because the Party had not convened a council before. According to the Party's code of regulations, every month a council had to be gathered, but it was never done. So, this time it wasn't convened simply to conform to the regulations. If possible, it could be gathered before the closing of the Assembly and before the deputies were sent to the local districts. The Party had never stuck to regulations before.

According to Faik Ahmet Bey, in the telegrams sent to the deputies it was written that the government was going to give an explanation of domestic and foreign

³⁷⁷ Ahmed, Faik, "Refet Pasha'nın Beyanatı", *İstikbal*, 11 Mayıs 1340/1924: 1183.

³⁷⁸ Yükseliman, Nihan, *Parti Devlet Bütünleşmesi*, (İstanbul: Gelenek, 2002) 16.

policies. But it was done because the İsmet Pasha government met with strong criticism from the free press. The government presented itself in a way to give account to the country and request a vote of confidence from the assembly. But the Assembly was closed and a meeting was against the government's interests. it was decided to pressure the Party, over which it had control, into giving a vote of confidece. But that was unacceptable and the government should never stop the criticisms of its own policies. Public opinion wouldn't be satisfied in that way. The vote of confidence for the government was prepared by the council of the party. The government always had the majority of the number of deputies, which could give it a vote of confidence, but this should be deserved rather than automatic. The government should not be complacent even if it got the vote of confidence of the assembly and the country needed a powerful government³⁷⁹.

4.3.3.THE PROBLEM OF THE EXILED RICH ARMENIANS:

After the parliamentary season, one of the most important events that occurred was the scandal of the Armenian riches. The scandal involved the Minister of the Interior Ferit Bey, Yunus Nadi and Kılıç Ali³⁸⁰. It was basically concerned with the smuggling into the country of Armenian riches and the ultimate aim was to advantageously sell off rich Armenians' properties. It was declared that a group of statesman was profiteering in this way³⁸¹. This scandal was one of the most important events to occupy Faik Ahmet Bey's articles after the end of the parliamentary season. For Faik Ahmet Bey, the event was proof of the necessity of the formation of a disciplinable administration and a staff management³⁸². And it was proof of the bad management of the Minister of the Interior Ferit Bey. Ferit Bey did not seriously handle the investigation and gave vague answers to the Assembly. But for Faik Ahmet bey the incident was a sign that the administrative mechanism had to be reformed, and a new governmental body had to be formed. There was great unlawfulness and the old system

³⁷⁹ Ahmed, Faik, "Divanın İctimar", *Istikbal*, 11 Haziran 1340/1924: 1207.

³⁸⁰ Zürcher, E.J., *The Progressive Party*, 63.

³⁸¹ Goloğlu, Mahmut, *Devrimler ve Tepkileri*, 58.

³⁸² Ahmed, Faik, "Tathirat İhtiyacı", *Istikbal*, 13 Mayıs 1340/1924: 1185.

of the assembly also had to be reshaped in order to prevent the administrative and social inadequacies which were preventing progress. The existing network of corruption in the government was exercising undue influence and that network had to be dismantled³⁸³, which could only be achieved with a serious investigation. It should not, however, be left to the government, because the government was also involved in this process. The government had created the existing administrative system for this very reason. They placed opportunist civil servants in high positions because of their blind loyalty and because they could be sold out easily. They were there because of their adulation. The mentality that brought those people into higher positions had to be changed and a new system of administration, belonging to men of principles, had to be formed³⁸⁴.

Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the real culprit was the government. A delegate planned the whole organization and was protected by the Minister. But the real order for came from Ferid Bey³⁸⁵. The rest only complied with the order but they were the ones who were punished and the Minister was unaffected. The Chief of police, chief of the prisons principal clerk were only following orders, and the Municipal Police was directed by Ferit Bey. The Minister was therefore responsible for the incident. During the investigation, Ferit Bey resigned from his office due to the secret telegram problem and he was replaced by the party clerk Recep Bey,³⁸⁶ who formed a commission of inquiry. But Faik Ahmet Bey believed that he alone could not be held responsible. And when the commission of inquiry discovered the abuses, he could not be charged easily. The commission understood that the former minister and deputies could not be investigated³⁸⁷. They were only able to investigate the officers. For this reason, he believed that the second Assembly had to take charge of the inquiry. The first one had never attended to its responsibility and if it had done so, the problem would already be solved. If the country wanted to reach the ideal high-level republic, the culprits of this scandal had to be punished properly. In the republican regime, the deputies, Ministers

³⁸³ Ahmed, Faik, "Suistimal Marazı", *Istikbal*, 15 Nisan 1340/1924: 1168.

³⁸⁴ Ahmed, Faik, "Bir Tahlil", *Istikbal*, 30 Temmuz 1340/1924: 1244.

³⁸⁵ Ahmed, Faik, "Bir Haber Etrafında", *Istikbal*, 21 Haziran 1340/1924: 1215.

³⁸⁶ Tunçay, Mete, *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nde Tek Parti Yönetimi*, 102.

³⁸⁷ Ahmed, Faik, "Meselenin Ruhü", *Istikbal*, 22 Nisan 1340/1924: 1173.

and the President had no privilege. Everyone had to be accountable before the laws. Privileges could only occur in a sultanate³⁸⁸.

Faik Ahmet Bey also criticised those who attacked the commission and the free press. According to him, the commission was working for the benefit of the Republican regime and they wanted to form a more transparent regime with no special privileges. He believed that all these incidents were exposed and investigated by the will of the free press. This was also proof of the existence of the free press in a country. With no free press, none of these could be found out. The Minister of the Interior was ignored by the government, but the press pushed forward for justice. For him, the free press was a necessity for a republican regime

4.3.4.CRITIQUE OF ISMET PASHA’S FOREIGN POLICY:

After the end of the first season of the Second Assembly, conflicts over foreign policy also started to emerge, mainly between Britain and Turkey over Mosul. The problem started at the end of the WWI and continued until the early Republican period. It was mainly about the status of Mosul and Britain’s policies of annexation³⁸⁹. On 19 May 1924 a conference was held in Istanbul between the two countries. During those days Faik Ahmet Bey wrote several articles criticising the foreign policy of the Ismet Pasha government. According to him, Turkish Foreign policy was going down a dark path led by Ismet Pasha. Conflicts started to emerge with Turkey’s neighbours and partners. Turkey had no safe, secure and confident relations. Ismet Pasha was only challenging foreign states and putting Turkey in an awkward position with its foes. Turkey was following an adventurer foreign policy under Ismet Pasha. He was annulling Turkey’s relations with the western and eastern states and damaging Turkey’s reputation. There was no doctrine of foreign policy, the policies of the Sultanate era continued, with the result that Turkey had no real partners among any western or eastern states. On the southern front, conflicts started to emerge with the French state. Also, Turkey and Britain were involved in a case of litigation over the Mosul conflict and a new

³⁸⁸ Ahmed, Faik, “Suistimal Mücadelesi”, *Istikbal*, 19 Temmuz 1340/1924: 1234.

³⁸⁹ Goloğlu, Mahmut, *Devrimler ve Tepkileri*, 61.

one was ready to emerge between Turkey and Russia. Italy also had intentions on the Anatolian coasts through the Island of Rhodos. These states were in cooperation with each other. But Faik Ahmet Bey believed that Turkey was left out of these new policies. Once, Turkey had an Eastern Policy run together with Russia, but it disappeared with the gaucherie of Ismet Pasha and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs³⁹⁰. So Turkish Foreign Policy was not rational, and it was following an aggressive policy. The country saw unnecessary troubles, trade and the economy declined and the foreign policy of the country faced menaces. It all stemmed from the government's disorganized and unplanned foreign policy. The government was devoid of organization and it was harmed by the conflicts. The lack of organization led to the emergence of misinformation. Regarding relations with the Italy, first it was claimed that the Italian state was transporting arms to Rhodos, but later on it was understood that the incident was falsely reported³⁹¹. Relations became needlessly tense as a result. Just like the Italian example, some false news about Russia was reported in the newspapers about statement from Trotsky declaring Russia's designs on the Istanbul Bosphorus. Again, tension heightened between Russia and Turkey. But Faik Ahmet Bey believed that Russia and Turkey had been foes since the national struggle era and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs had to act responsibly in order to avoid any tension and try to keep its pledge of friendship with Russia³⁹².

With the rising hostility of the newspapers to the foreign policy, Ağaoğlu Ahmet Bey wrote an article in the *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* newspaper. He accused the critical newspapers of helping the foreign states inadvertently, and asked for the newspapers' support. He said that the press should only criticise the government on domestic affairs, and had to support foreign policy. Faik Ahmet Bey found that article unctuous, and said that Ağaoğlu Ahmet Bey demanded implicit confidence from the newspapers. According to him, the government was trying to silence its critics and force the press to blindly believe in the government. The press had the right to point out any false policies³⁹³ and they were doing it not out of betrayal, but to try to correct false policies.

³⁹⁰ Ahmed, Faik, "Açık Konuşalım", *Istikbal*, 2 Haziran 1340/1924: 1200.

³⁹¹ Ahmed, Faik, "Kamerde Fil" *Istikbal*, 10 Haziran 1340/1924: 1206.

³⁹² Ahmed, Faik, "Rusya İle Münasebatımız", *Istikbal*, 12 Haziran 1340/1924: 1208.

³⁹³ Ahmed, Faik, "Matbuatın Tenkidi", *Istikbal*, 17 Haziran 1340/1924: 1212.

The defects of the Ministers and the head of office had to be announced. WWI had showed the public the results of implicit confidence in the government. The head offices, or governments should not lead the people to constitute policies single handedly. The press was in opposition in order to avoid the repetition of previous mistaken policies. The government had to adjust itself and get used to the critics, because the press would never silence itself until better domestic and foreign policies emerged. That was the source of the Anatolian Revolution. It was based on respect for public opinion. Without that, the revolution could be only a formal one.

4.3.5. THE GENERAL EVALUATION OF THE NEW REGIME BY FAIK AHMET BEY:

After the end of the first session of the Assembly, Faik Ahmet Bey wrote his general evaluation of the new regime and defined his opinions. First he started the critique of the new regime and the principle of the sovereignty of the people. According to him, in the new regime the principle was only in theory. He started to express his feelings by comparing the new regime and the principle with the French elections. In France, the opposition party had won the elections by the will of the people. The governments' policies were not appreciated. According to Faik Ahmet Bey that was the sign of real sovereignty of the people. During the electoral process, the government didn't use its powers and authority to prevent the opposition's success. None of the governmental powers such as the governor, gendarmarie or police took part in the electoral process or interfered. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that those interferences could only occur in countries in which elections are held by the appointment of the centre. In modern countries, the government should never interfere with the people's choices. Even a President of a modern country who wanted to make its domestic and foreign policies stronger should never do that. The President could act like a dictator, but when the electoral process started, he should show his total respect. When the election started, the power was in the hands of the people and their choices should be respected.

When it was compared with the regime of Turkey, Faik Ahmet Bey found the French system's respect for the will of the people deeply enviable. He believed that the

real sovereignty of the people should only be manifested during times of elections. And in a regime in which the people could not exert their will freely, sovereignty of the people would remain theoretical. If the government interfered in the will of the people, it would be a regime of sovereignty of the government. In the new Turkish regime, the people's will was accepted only in theory and in reality it was worthless; it was only an illusion. And the elections were only the appointments of government bureaucrats. The governor, the gendarmarie and the police, all of the powers of the government took part in the process³⁹⁴.

Faik Ahmet Bey advocated that the Turkish people should freely define their will if a regime similar to French example was to be formed. It was obvious that the new regime would not show respect for the people. The will of the people would only be respected by new political ethics which understood the sovereignty of the people. And the new regime was far from that.

He continued to criticize the Turkish system in comparison with France when the French President resigned after the elections. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the resignation was a sign of political discipline which was absent in Turkey³⁹⁵. He resigned because he had violated his authority and neutrality in order to support a political party. The French President was elected for seven years and he had to be neutral. He shouldn't have any relation with a party, and when this principle was violated, he was forced to resign.

Faik Ahmet Bey also believed that a President had to be neutral and independent of any political party. The chair of the Presidency had to be removed from any political party or organization. A head of the state was the head of the whole nation. When he deviated from this and supported a party, he would change from being the head of the nation to being the head of a party and its members, which was inappropriate to the chair. Whenever a party won an election, the President had to act like the head of the nation, and allow the people's sovereignty to manifest itself.

Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the recent events in France showed the real meaning of sovereignty of the people and Republic. These did not exist in Turkey in

³⁹⁴ Ahmed, Faik, "Milletin Hakimiyeti", *Istikbal*, 15 Mayıs 1340/1924: 1187.

³⁹⁵ Ahmed, Faik, "Bir Temaşa, Bir Ders", *Istikbal*, 15 Haziran 1340/1924: 1210.

their true sense. The new regime had to consider these events and try to form a real Republican regime underpinned by the will of the people³⁹⁶.

4.3.6. MUSTAFA KEMAL PASHA'S NATIONAL TOUR AND SPEECHES IN TRABZON AND SAMSUN:

The conflict between the opposition and government continued after the resignation of Refet Bey. The crisis of the Armenian riches also occurred and deepened the conflict. At the same time, foreign hostilities emerged between Turkey and Britain over the Mosul problem. With the crisis mounting, Mustafa Kemal Pasha decided to make a national tour in order to experience public opinion³⁹⁷. He started from Ankara on 25 July 1924 and reached Trabzon on 16 April 1924. Trabzon was especially important for the Pasha because of its opposition and its independent position. Trabzon had been opposed to the policies of the new regime since the Defence of the Natural Rights society. It had strong connections with Enver Pasha and also rejected the transformation of the society to the People's Party³⁹⁸. The opposition was now continued by *Istikbal* newspaper. Mustafa Kemal Pasha made a significant speech to the Trabzon branch of the People's Party. In particular, he referred to the presumed conflict of interest in his dual presidency (of the People's Party and of the nation). In his speech, Mustafa Kemal Pasha said that there was a single loyalty in the country, which was to the republican regime and revolutions. According to him, the People's Party's dominant philosophy was the same and, because of this, he was the head of the Party and the President of the country at the same time. But he received a frosty reception in the city and after the end of the visit the Governor of Trabzon was re-appointed.

During the Pasha's visit, Faik Ahmet Bey wrote several articles as a response to the Pasha's speech. He strongly criticised the speech. According to Faik Ahmet Bey, the Pasha declared that the Republican People's Party was only represented by the Republican regime and the revolution, and he showed the Party as the symbol of young Turkey's liberty. But Faik Ahmet Bey believed that supporting the ideal of republican

³⁹⁶ Ahmed, Faik, "Bir Temaşa, Bir Ders", *Istikbal*, 15 Haziran 1340/1924: 1210.

³⁹⁷ Goloğlu, Mahmut, *Devrimler ve Tepkileri*, 64.

³⁹⁸ Zürcher, E.J., *The Progressive Republican Party*, 67.

regime and social revolution should not be under the monopoly of a single party. There needed to be many parties who could support those ideals. Being a “republican and revolutionary” couldn’t be limited to a single party’s programme. Even if they supported the same ideals, there could be specific differences among the “supporters of republic and revolution” in terms of reaching specific goals. For example, the People’s Party supported a centralist administration even though it was supporting the republican regime and the revolution. However, there were also some republicans who rejected it and supported the self-government of the people. Because of these kinds of particular differences, it was impossible to unite everyone under a single party. Even if everyone could be a republican and revolutionary, it was still impossible. It was unnatural to have a single party. And the head of the party should never unite and represent all of the existing ideals and individuals. That claim was nonsense. Faik Ahmet Bey also stated that there was a significant difference between the Defence of the Natural Rights Societies and the People’s Party. Defence of the Natural Rights Societies had been formed spontaneously by the people’s will in order to rescue the country and it was a coalition of all the beliefs whose ultimate aim was to end the occupation. But the People’s Party was a political party, which was different from the societies. As a response to the Pasha, Faik Ahmet Bey also mentioned that more parties were going to be formed as a result of the people’s sovereignty and the republican regime. When conditions returned to normal, this had to happen. With these new parties in the parliament, stability and a natural daily life could start³⁹⁹.

Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the president’s position and role had to be above every party and daily politics. He had to supervise the parties and play the role of a referee between them. There could be strong conflicts between the political parties and so he had to be a negotiator and vindicate the people’s rights. In that role he could protect the state, but when he was the head of a political party, this was not possible. He would be taking sides in disputes and be seen as the enemy by rival parties. The President’s neutrality had to be achieved as soon as possible.

During the Pasha’s visit, Faik Ahmet Bey continued his criticisms of the political parties and partisanship. He believed that after all the reforms and revolutions,

³⁹⁹ Ahmed, Faik, “Riyaset-i Cumhuriyet ve Fırka Reisliği”, *Istikbal*, 21 Eylül 1340/1924: 1288.

the partisanship, hate and will to dominate still existed. And he believed that the structure of the parties and partisanship was same as in the old era. There were no differences between the political partisanship of the Sultanate and the Republic. The political structure of the country was still inappropriate for party life. The political parties had to be seen as a part of normal parliamentary life, but, on the contrary, they were perceived as a tool of coercion used to suppress the people and society, to putch the opponents and to achieve the domination of the leading man. During revolutionary times, single party dictatorships were formed in order to end the sultanate and personal sovereignty, but in the end a new form of tyranny emerged.

Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the structure of the political parties and partisanship had not been transformed with the new regime. The habits and the hated of the past continued. And he believed that transformation could not be achieved until a revolution in minds and spirits occurred. The virtuosity of the republic had to affect parties and partisanship. After that, political minds could change and progress could be achieved. The citizens of a republic had to live under an Assembly consisting of free deputies who were law abiding. If a regime, a political party or a leader exerts pressure and restrictions, it creates tyranny; by an individual, elite circle or party dictatorship; and all of these were non-republican. In a republican regime, even the weakest person and a President were equal before the laws. Domination by a monopolist party was incompatible with a Republican regime. A Republic needed more than one political party for the parliament. Sovereignty of the people depended on a multi-party regime which consisted of various opposition parties. With the existence of these, the people could make their choice. A single party would always inevitably be a party of domination and tyranny.

The Turkish single party became a party of self-seekers through the lack of a political programme. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the People's Party had to be united with a common ideal and political programme and that it had to abandon its partisanship and become a political party of ideals and creeds. Otherwise, as a party of a close elite circle, it could be a weak and deficient organization only supported by the local imams,

mukhtars and officials of Istanbul, by a small administrative committee on Trabzon and by a limited and particular minority in other quarters⁴⁰⁰.

Faik Ahmet Bey continued to his responses to the Pasha. He wrote an article after the Samsun Speech, and continued to express his views on the political parties and the republican regime. According to Faik Ahmet Bey the whole tour was for the purposes of partisanship. Through his speeches, Mustafa Kemal Pasha was trying to convince the people that the People's Party was their ultimate representative. He claimed that the whole of society was united by the party. But Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the Pasha was the President and his propaganda efforts for the Party were illegitimate. The Pasha, however, stepped up his propaganda and said that the People's Party was the single party of the country and extended over every part of it. He added that the formation of various parties and a multiparty system was inappropriate for the peace and security of the country. National unity had to be achieved because the situation of the Republic was still problematic and the existence of various parties could therefore be a dividing factor for the nation and the country.

Faik Ahmet Bey totally rejected the Pasha's views. According to him, a concurrence of opinion could never be achieved on political convictions and all Republicans could not be gathered together in a single party. Republicans were divided in political opinions; there were left wing, right wing, moderate, and hardliner republicans. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that in a single party regime, the natural rights of all those who did not join the party were restricted. And with that restriction, unity of thoughts could not be achieved. Since everyone had common goals, and everyone was republican, one Republican Party was enough for the country. A Republican regime needs the furthest freedom of thought and expression. Those in power could not force others to think in the same way. That was undemocratic and unrepublican. And Faik Ahmet Bey believed that, whether it be a person or a party, dictatorships were the most short-lived regimes in world history. To describe a single party regime as a regime of peace and security was false. According to him, peace and security should only come when various parties were formed and started to have connections with each other. When it was achieved and those parties joined the parliament, the struggle between

⁴⁰⁰ Ahmed, Faik, "Bizde Fırka ve Fırkacılık", Istikbal, 23 Eylül 1340/1924: 1290.

different ideas and groups would come to an end and political crises could be avoided. Preventing the formation of various parties was only delaying the problems⁴⁰¹.

Faik Ahmet Bey also believed that the formation of different parties was a must for the latitude of thought. The new constitution defined the latitude of thought, freedom of conscience, freedom of meeting and establishing societies as social rights. And in a republican regime those rights had to be put into practice.

4.3.7. THE END OF THE FIRST YEAR OF THE REPUBLICAN REGIME:

The first year of the Republican regime was celebrated with ceremonies ten days after Mustafa Kemal Pasha's return from the national tour. During the first year of the declaration of the Republican regime, Faik Ahmet Bey wrote an article and assessed the situation of the Republic. His view was mainly critical. He had expected the formation of a regime which would better fit republican ideals. So the new regime wasn't republican enough for him.

First of all, Faik Ahmet Bey mentioned that 29 October 1923 was just a day when the existing situation was given an official name. The country had been ruled with an unnamed republican regime and sovereignty of the people since the abolition of the Sultanate and even before. The National Assembly, which held all the executive and legislative powers, represented the unnamed republic. The Assembly formed cabinets internally, appointed ambassadors and it was the head of the state. There was a republic based on the unity of powers, but it transformed into the new republic. For Faik Ahmet Bey, the real day of the declaration of the republic was the day when the abolition of the sultanate occurred. The basic character of the 29 October was different. For supporters of the unity of powers and superiority of the Assembly, it was a day of backtracking to the past. For those who supported the unity of powers, the system better represented the sovereignty of the people. And for the ones who supported the actual system of separation of powers, a Republic was inconsistent with domination and tyranny.

⁴⁰¹ Ahmed, Faik, "Cumhuriyette Fırkalar", Istikbal, 1 Teşrinievvel 1340/1924: 1297.

A Republic was a regime in which the will of the people was represented in the best way. Within the regime, there should be no kind of domination. But there was a long way to go, and Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the Turkish Republic was far from the best form of a republican regime. Its best form was a level on which everyone was aware of his/her rights, individual liberties were fully supplied, no higher classes or elite circles occurred within the free society, and the people became the ultimate ruler and sovereign⁴⁰².

According to Faik Ahmet Bey, the Turkish Republic was at the initial stage. Many of the political habits and systems of pre-republican times were still functioning and this was inconsistent with republican ideals and sovereignty of the people. For Faik Ahmet Bey, the best example of this situation was the electoral law. The law belonged to the age of the Sultanate but it was still applied in the Republican age. The republican elite believed that sovereignty of the people could be achieved with that law. Because of that, between the ancien regime and the new regime, no great differences could occur in the level of the representation of the people's sovereignty. The people's participation in the administration was only theoretical. Local administration was facing a centralisation worse than in the Sultanate era. No great changes occurred in the election of the deputies. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that all these structural changes had to be made and that no real republic could be formed until that time. According to him, republican ideals and the revolution were still in theoretical form, but had to be actualized and penetrate the souls of the people.

4.3.8. OPENING OF THE SECOND TERM OF THE SECOND ASSEMBLY:

After a six month official holiday, the Second Assembly started its new season on 1 November 1924 with a speech by Mustafa Kemal Pasha. In the Speech he mentioned that a new Anatolia was going to be formed under the leadership of Ankara. The country had been neglected by the ancien regime for a very long time, and now,

⁴⁰² Ahmed, Faik "Bir Devr-i Senevi", Istikbal, 29 Teşrinievvel 1340/1924: 1321.

under the leadership of Ankara, Anatolia was going to be the new center of civilisation⁴⁰³. The Ismet Pasha cabinet received a vote of confidence on 8 November.

First of all, Faik Ahmet Bey believed that a six month official holiday was accepted for a purpose. The Ismet Pasha Government could not function efficiently because it was hindered by the opponent deputies. The Assembly, and the Government were always under scrutiny and its dismissal or resignation was always a possibility. The Government added an article to the new constitution granting the six months official holiday for the Assembly, and the first parliamentary season closed down for six months. The Government was, in this way, protected from the Assembly and from the opponent deputies for a six months period⁴⁰⁴. For Faik Ahmet Bey this showed the Government's hostility to the people's sovereignty. The opponent deputies were criticising the government in the name of the people, but their voices were silenced for six months. The Government was hostile to any opposition and wanted to rule the country freely without any hindrance. It was demanding absolute control. But Faik Ahmet Bey was sure that in the second term, the opponent deputies were going to ask the Government to account for its actions during the six month official holiday. The opposition would investigate, and also increase in numbers.

Faik Ahmet Bey was sure that the power of the opposition movement inside the Assembly was going increase, and that its power and the people's will would force the Party to form a political programme. In its present state, the People's Party was a reluctant and unwilling coalition of deputies with very different ideas and ideologies. Due to the lack of a party programme with political ideas, that coalition was united under a single party. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the coalition was close to breaking down, as conflicts inside the Party were appearing. The military discipline of the Party was getting weaker with the debates between the Party's own deputies. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that a wave of elimination and refinement of delegates could occur in the Second Term of the Assembly, or that the opponent deputies would resign and form an independent group⁴⁰⁵. He also believed that the majority deputies would try to suppress the opposition within the Party or force these opponents to resign. This could in fact be

⁴⁰³ Kocatürk, Utkan, Atatürk ve Cumhuriyet Tarihi Kronolojisi, 424.

⁴⁰⁴ Ahmed, Faik, "Tatilin Sonunda", *Istikbal*, 5 Teşrinievvel 1340/1924: 1300.

⁴⁰⁵ Ahmed, Faik, "Gelecek Devrede", *Istikbal*, 28 Temmuz 1340/1924: 1242.

beneficial for the political life of the country. If those deputies resigned, they could form a new party or a group to check and balance the People's Party's domination. Day by day the People's Party was transforming into a Party of domination and tyranny, and Faik Ahmet Bey was concerned about the situation. New Parties with different political programmes and agendas had to appear. That was a must for a regime of democracy and the sovereignty of the people. Freedom of ideas had to flourish under a multi-party regime and he was hopeful that it would occur with the second term.

After the opening of the second term, a Republican Party meeting was also held. The meeting was about the actions of the Ismet Pasha Government during the official holiday of the Assembly. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the actions of the Ismet Pasha cabinet would be hidden from the people with a secret meeting and that the Government would use the Mosul problem as an excuse to silence the opposition's criticisms and make a speech about it to preserve national unity against the foreign enemies⁴⁰⁶. The Government would then give a short statement to the public and its actions in the six month period would be concealed. Informing the public about its policies was the ultimate duty of a government, but the Government failed to do so as it was afraid of losing support.

4.3.9. THE NEW ELECTORAL LAW:

After the opening of the new parliamentary season of the Assembly, new discussions emerged. One of them was about the electoral law. Faik Ahmet Bey also demonstrated his hostility to the existing electoral law in his articles. According to him, the electoral law and indirect suffrage was against the spirit of the revolution, republicanism and the sovereignty of the people⁴⁰⁷. He believed in creating a new electoral law and electoral system which was suited to the new conditions in Turkey. For Faik Ahmet Bey, the existing electoral system –suffrage indirect– belonged to the sultanate era. Indirect suffrage was a system that was used in constitutional monarchies or sultanates; it was incompatible with a republican regime. It was against the principles

⁴⁰⁶ Ahmed, Faik, "Fırka İctimai", *Istikbal*, 25 Teşrinievvel 1340/1924: 1317.

⁴⁰⁷ Ahmed, Faik, "İntihab Kanunu 1", *İstikbal*, 30 Teşrinievvel 1340/1924: 1322.

of a democratic republican regime, which defined the people as the sovereign power. So a new law based on the principle of the sovereignty of the people had to be prepared. The meaning of the principle was the people being allowed to rule themselves. It could be possible when the people and their will and administration became a reality. And it could only be achieved with a new electoral system –direct suffrage.

According to Faik Ahmet Bey the difference between a sultanate and a republic had to be reflected in every aspect of political life and the law. The people had to be represented accurately in a republican regime and Faik Ahmet Bey believed that it was impossible to form a democracy with the laws of the old regime. The new regime depended on the people's sovereignty and its rules had to be regulated according to that principle. For him, the elections were a significant part of the development of the sovereignty of the people. He believed that every regime that broke the old system of politics, which had been based on divine laws, and gave the sovereignty to the people created jurisprudence according to the necessities of the new regimes. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that indirect suffrage was created by the old regimes, and occurred before the revolutions of the sovereignty of the people. It was a method created during the absolutist monarchies in which the right to suffrage depended on the owners of land and wealth. In order to vote, people had to have property or pay a certain amount of tax to the State. But when nations gradually started to gain their liberties and destroy the institutions which had assumed their right of sovereignty, those electoral systems disappeared and a rule of law was created. Democracies were formed with new electoral systems and universal suffrage and direct suffrage were accepted⁴⁰⁸. Faik Ahmet Bey mentioned that all civilised countries had direct suffrage, and indirect suffrage was a remnant of the old regime for the Turkish Republic. He believed that the Turkish Revolution had to change the system. The revolution had to abandon the system of the sultanate and create a new one; a regime of sovereignty of the people and free citizens.

Faik Ahmet Bey was completely opposed to indirect suffrage. According to him, in that election method a second elector interfered between the people and their representatives. This was undemocratic and occurred under the sultanate. If those second electors were acting according to the wills of the first electors, their intervention

⁴⁰⁸ Ahmed, Faik "İntihab Kanunu 2", İstikbal, 1 Teşrinisani 1340/1924: 1323.

was unnecessary. If they were acting according to their own wills, that was totally against the people who used their sovereignty during the election times. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the deputies were the representatives of the people, and they took their position from the people only. If sovereignty was given to the people unconditionally, the second electors and indirect suffrage had to be abolished. The people were not actually sovereign under that electoral system, and they took no further interest in elections. Even though the supporters of indirect suffrage argued that the people were not mentally, politically or educationally ready to elect their deputies directly, Faik Ahmet Bey believed that it was a necessity for the democracy⁴⁰⁹.

4.4. THE CRISIS OF THE PEOPLE’S PARTY AND FORMATION OF THE PROGRESSIVE REPUBLICAN PARTY:

4.4.1. RESIGNATION OF PASHAS:

For long time Faik Ahmet Bey had believed that a crisis in the People’s Party was inevitable. For him it was a heterogeneous Party consisting of people who did not have any common political ideas, and the continuity of the Party was impossible⁴¹⁰. The Party didn’t have a political programme. It was not a party of political ideas and principles and its republicanism was open to question. And for Faik Ahmet Bey the formation of a democracy based on a multi-party regime was a normal natural state. The regime used the revolutions as an excuse to delay the formation of the multi-party regime. According to the People’s Party, conditions in the country were not right for democracy because the revolution was still in progress. In a period of revolutionary changes, democracy could be delayed. But for Faik Ahmet Bey all of these were poor excuses. The revolution had ended and the country and its people were ready for the formation of a democratic republic⁴¹¹. He believed that this demand was natural and the Party and the regime would not be able to resist to it.

⁴⁰⁹ Ahmed, Faik “İntibah Kanunu 3”, *İstikbal*, 2 Teşrinisani 1340/1924: 1324.

⁴¹⁰ Ahmed, Faik “Yeni Kabine”, *İstikbal*, 25 Teşrinisani 1339/1924: 1342.

⁴¹¹ Ahmed, Faik “Son Haftanın Siyasi Hadiseleri”, *İstikbal*, 22 Teşrinisani 1339/1924: 1340.

The new regime tried to keep the Army out of politics. And a new legal status was prepared to regulate the state and the army. First of all, the participation of the military commanders in the Assembly meetings was prohibited by the 385th article. The aim of this change was to silence many significant leaders of the opposition group who were also members of army. And after several regulations of law, the Ministry of the General Staff was placed under the authority of Mustafa Kemal Pasha. With that change, the power of the deputies in military service declined. All of these regulations were received negatively and discontent occurred. The strongest reaction came from Kazım (Karabekir) Pasha. On 26 October Kazım (Karabekir) Pasha, the Inspector of the First Army, submitted his resignation from his military command because he was being harrassed and his reports and recommendations were being ignored by the General Staff⁴¹². The resignation of Ali Fuat (Cebesoy) followed. The newspapers interpreted this development as a sure sign that an opposition party would now be founded. As its leaders, the same four names were constantly mentioned: Rauf (Orbay), Refet (Bele), Adnan (Adıvar), and İsmail (Canbolat), sometimes collectively known as Dörtler (The Four)⁴¹³.

Mustafa Kemal Pasha perceived the resignation of the Pasha as a plot against him personally, but for Faik Ahmet Bey it was a victory for democracy. According to him, the formation of an opposition party was normal and indeed necessary for a democratic country and he therefore supported the resignation of Kazım Karabekir and Ali Fuat Cebesoy. According to him, it was obvious that deputyship was incompatible with military duty and he congratulated the Pashas on their resignation. But Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the structure of the Assembly would change after the Pashas joined. There were influential groups in the Assembly who could perceive the event as a threat to their own powers.

Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the Government and the People's Party were affected by Kazım Karabekir's resignation and participation to the Assembly. The deputies of the Assembly, who wielded enormous influence, felt threatened. Those were the deputies who always supported the government and took their power for granted.

⁴¹² Karabekir, Kazım, *Pashaların Kavgası-İnkılap Hareketlerimiz* (İstanbul: Emre Yay, 1994) 297-315.

⁴¹³ Zürcher, *The Progressive Republican Party*, 45.

For them their benefit was even more important than the benefit of the country. They formed an elite circle in the Assembly, and they were hostile to any parliamentary act which could weaken their influence. They used the excuse of protecting the revolution and principles in order to reject any change in the Assembly. They had discountenanced Refet Pasha (Bele) and it was now time for Kazım Pasha.

According to Faik Ahmet Bey, Kazım Karabekir's accession to the Assembly also worried that elite circle. They accused him of being a supporter of the reactionaries to the Revolution. According to that circle, Kazım Pasha favoured the reactionaries, but Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the elite circle was protecting their monopoly, and that they were defaming a very honourable commander of the national movement. They were afraid of the liberal and free deputies on the Assembly who threatened their grip on power.

The influential elite circle was afraid of the Assembly gaining power and checking the government's policies and wanted weak assemblies which would always accept every decision. The circle consisted of deputies whose political careers had advanced rapidly, but not on merit, and who were afraid of losing their power and status. Kazım Karabekir, Ali Fuat Cebesoy intended a powerful assembly which could check their policies and this was perceived as a threat. The circle would ask to dissolve the Assembly and form a new one with toadying deputies. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the influential deputies put their own interests above the national interest. The country needed a powerful assembly which could check and balance the government. And that meant that the assembly needed powerful deputies⁴¹⁴.

4.4.2. THE OPPOSITION ORGANISES:

After the Kazım Karabekir and Ali Fuat Cebesoy incident, debates continued in the Assembly. The main focus of attention when the assembly met for its first real day of debates in the new session, on 5 November, was on the interpellation of the Minister of Exchange, Rebuilding and Resettlement over the refuge question. And views about the mismanagement and chaos during the resettlement of Turks coming from Greece in

⁴¹⁴ Faik Ahmed, "Günün Hadiseleri", *Istikbal*, 3 Teşrinisani 1340/1924: 1325.

the population exchange were expressed⁴¹⁵. According to the deputies, the houses for the refugee Turks had been taken over by local Turks long before the immigrants arrived and it was said that quite a number of politicians in the People's Party had also taken the opportunity to enrich themselves. On November the 8th, two motions were put before the Assembly. One –by Feridun Fikri (Düşünel) – demanding the establishment of a seven-member commission of enquiry, the other –Ali (Çetinkaya)– expressing confidence in the government⁴¹⁶. The latter was put to the vote and accepted with 148 against 19 votes. Immediately after the vote Rauf (Orbay) and ten of his supporters resigned from the Party⁴¹⁷.

After the split between the deputies, many different reactions came from the press. In the Istanbul press, the majority of which supported Rauf's (Orbay) group (papers like Tanin, the Tevhid-i Efkar and the Son Telgraf), very optimistic estimates circulated⁴¹⁸. In the days after the great debates in the newspapers, a new wave of resignations involving forty or fifty deputies was expected. According to Yalman the number reached 150 deputies (Yalman, 144).

Faik Ahmet Bey greatly welcomed the resignations with his articles in *Istikbal*. Faik Ahmet Bey was sure that the single-party regime was an unsuitable regime for the country and was the result of the imposition and the stubbornness of the People's Party. It was also unsustainable. Faik Ahmet Bey therefore supported the resignation of the discontented deputies from the Party and the formation of the new parties in the Assembly⁴¹⁹. The republican regime was incompatible with the tyranny of individuals or parties or any kind of monopolism. According to him, there had to be centre, right and left wing parties in the assembly and every political ideology had to be represented. For this reason, all the discontented deputies had to resign and new parties should be formed. It was normal for a republican regime. Due to his belief in democracy, Faik Ahmet Bey also supported the formation of the new conservative party.

⁴¹⁵ Goloğlu, Mahmut, *Devrimler ve Tepkileri*, 79-90.

⁴¹⁶ Zürcher, E.J., *The Progressive Party*, 50.

⁴¹⁷ Istanbul deputy Adnan (Adivar), Selahattin, Muhtar, Erzincan deputy Sabit (Sağiroğlu), Sivas deputy Halis Turgut, Dersim deputy Feridun Fikri (Düşünel), Ordu deputy Faik Bey, Erzurum deputy Rüştü and Istanbul deputy Refet (Bele) Pashas. (Tunçay, Mete, *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nde Tek Parti Yönetimi*, 107).

⁴¹⁸ Zürcher, E.J., *The Progressive Party*, 52.

⁴¹⁹ Faik Ahmed, "Son Haftanın Siyasi Hadiseleri", *Istikbal*, 22 Teşrinisani 1340/1924: 1340.

Some of the members of the People's Party and the Assembly mentioned that Turkey wasn't ready for a multi-party regime. But Faik Ahmet Bey strongly believed that the idea of republic went together with democracy and the multi-party regime. In a free country, a single elite circle should not rule by itself; that was tyranny and absolutism and in conflict with republican regime. The modern world was evolving through democracy while tyranny and absolutism was the regime of the old world. Faik Ahmet Bey stated that the parliament was the representative of the sovereignty of the people, and it should not consist of only a small elite circle or a single party. Formation of a balancing parties or independent groups was a great necessity and the development of parliamentary life depended on this.

He also mentioned that the legacy of the political parties and opposition parties was terrible. Some of the opposition parties turned out to be traitors to the country. And the result of the political competition was disastrous for the country⁴²⁰. As a result, political parties in general were perceived by the people as harmful organizations. However, their formation was necessary and Faik Ahmet Bey was therefore glad that the resigned deputies were heroes of the national independence movement. He emphasized that some of the deputies who resigned were significant heroes of the National Struggle and the Anatolian Revolution. He also commented that it was obvious that the resignations from the People's Party should continue⁴²¹. It seemed that a new libertarian group, respectful to the freedom of opinion, would be formed by the leaders of the national independence. The sovereignty of the people and freedom of opinion could be achieved and the People's Parties' Executive Committee's domination over the parliamentary discussions could be brought to an end. The Single Party Regime was corruptive and unsustainable and it created a monopolistic elite circle and forced the rest of the deputies to obey the circle, with single parties always branching off. It was obvious that this was happening in the People's Party. Instead of being a political party with a Party Programme gathered around political principles, the People's Party was an ensemble of force and monopolism and it closed the assembly to opposite opinions and opposition with its sultanate. So the new party or group, which should be formed, had to

⁴²⁰ Ahmed, Faik, "Havadisler Arasında", *Istikbal*, 27 Teşrinievvel 1340/1924: 1319.

⁴²¹ Ahmed, Faik, "Fırkadan İstifalar", *Istikbal*, 11 Teşrinisani 1349/1924: 1332.

have a strict political programme. Unlike the People's Party, the resigned deputies had to write a political programme⁴²² and share it with the public. The new group should not only criticise the government policies; it had to constitute a programme defining itself as liberalist and declare it at the Assembly meetings and check the unbalanced power of the ruling party. The ultimate aim of the group had to be to actualize public rule and supply the free rule of the society under an unconstrained regime, which couldn't be formed by the People's Party⁴²³. The new party or the new group had to openly follow liberal ideas and the sovereignty of the people, and with its formation, a new route to the people and the sovereignty of the people would be opened.

Faik Ahmet Bey believed that in a political party which consisted of the spirit of monopolism, a sincere harmony and a participating consensus of opinion could never be achieved. The circle of monopolism would always tighten and in the end the most disqualified deputies could be appointed as director by the will of the absolute ruler. And he strongly believed that the assembly had to consist of other parties, which had various principles, and with their existence the monopolism and tyranny of single parties could be prevented. In that case, the Assembly could represent every existing political opinion and movement, and the opposition parties could control the majority party's potential corruption. But those parties had to accept republican and revolutionary principles. Any party which did not accept these principles should not even be formed.

According to Faik Ahmet Bey, uncontrolled political power could always bring corruption. Even though it was named as republican and labelled a follower of the principle of the sovereignty of the people, if there were no opposition parties on the assembly, a single party regime could always abuse its power. And whether the tyranny belonged to a person or a party, it created domination. More than personal tyranny, the tyranny of an elite circle was much more repressive because it created an irresponsible regime. But Faik Ahmet Bey was sure that in a republican regime, there was no place for any kind of tyranny, whether it came from a person or an elite circle.⁴²⁴ If any kind of tyranny and political pressure existed, it was not a republic. For Faik Ahmet Bey, the

⁴²² Ahmed, Faik, "Bir Bahsin Etrafında", *Istikbal*, 21 Teşrinievvel 1340/1924: 1314.

⁴²³ Ahmed, Faik, "Bahsin Devami", *Istikbal*, 22 Teşrinievvel 1340/1924: 1315.

⁴²⁴ Ahmed, Faik, "Fırka'dan İstifalar", *Istikbal*, 11 Teşrinisani 1340/1924: 1332.

People's Party was a great source of tyranny. He believed that the People's Party inhibited political competition and impeded the accession of any other party to the Assembly by using its governmental powers. The Party intervened in the free elections, and prevented the election of the people's own deputies and formed a monopoly of an elite circle which was almost religiously devoted to the Party. And it called itself a republican party.

But Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the repressive policies of the People's Party created discontent within the parties and among the general public. The people were against tyranny, and it was their natural right. The society started to demand a free political life including several parties and Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the resignations would help end the domination of the People's Party. After that, another party could be formed and the sovereignty of the people could be represented better. And he believed that the best persons to do that were the former heroes of the national struggle. With their efforts, a multi-party system and politics based on free political competition could be formed in the Assembly. With the effect of the new party, the People's Party would reform itself into a political party.

4.4.3. THE ROAD TO THE FORMATION OF THE PROGRESSIVE REPUBLICAN PARTY:

After Mustafa Kemal Pasha's Anatolian tour, rumours about the formation of a new party started⁴²⁵. And after the resignations, these rumours became louder. From the start of the rumours, Faik Ahmet Bey showed his support for the formation of a new party and he specified his countenance to its leaders. According to Faik Ahmet Bey, all of the mentioned leaders such as Kazım Karabekir, Ali Fuat, Rauf, Refet and Rüştü were men of prestige. They were the companions and directors of the national struggle⁴²⁶. Faik Ahmet Bey also mentioned his support if Kazım Karabekir became the chairman of the Party and Hüseyin Rauf Bey the general secretary. For him, a party under the leadership of those men would be of benefit to Turkish political life.

⁴²⁵ Zürcher, E.J., *The Progressive Party*, 44.

⁴²⁶ Ahmed, Faik, "Yeni Fırka", *Istikbal*, 13 Teşrinisani 1339/1924: 1333.

From the beginning of the rumours to the actual formation of the Party, Faik Ahmet Bey showed his support for the new party. Faik Ahmet Bey was one of the earliest critics of the single-party regime. According to him, it was deeply in contrast with the republican regime. And he believed that the source of this regime was in the partisanship of the People's Party. The Party wanted to rule the country with the methods of the ancien regime. The Party wanted to be the absolute power over the centre and provinces of the country. It wanted to control the assembly, and the appointment of the governors, government, officers, and kaimakams who would control the counties and have local consulates. But Faik Ahmet Bey believed that all these powers brought corruption and he believed that a multi-party system had to be formed⁴²⁷. A new party, or a new group could make the Assembly more free, independent and active. According to him, the People's Party became inefficient because of its structure. The Party contained the conservative and liberal opponents in it and became nonfunctional. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that sweeping changes to the Party were necessary. And also for the sake of real democracy, the single-party regime had to be ended and new parties had to be formed. Single-party regimes didn't exist in any modern countries. And those regimes could only occur in a country in which a monarch or an elite circle held the power. Faik Ahmet Bey strongly believed that a single-party was against republican ideals. Any kind of domination or tyranny coming from an individual or a party was against the general spirit of a republican regime and sovereignty of the people. And for him, for the sake of the continuity of the republic transition to the multi-party regime was absolutely necessary. A Republic and personal or party tyrannies could not go together. Tyrannies could only go together with absolutist regimes and for Turkey the age of the sultanate, elite circle tyranny or personal dictatorship was over. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that Turkey's only choice was the formation of democracy⁴²⁸ and he therefore warmly welcomed the formation of new parties. For him, with the existence of multiple parties a democracy could be formed, the Assembly could function much better and the corruption of the single-party regime could end. And he also mentioned that the people should start play a part in their own

⁴²⁷ Ahmed, Faik, "Muhtaç Olduğumuz Fırka ve İntihab Usülleri", *Istikbal*, 9 Temmuz 1340/1924: 1231.

⁴²⁸ Ahmed, Faik, "Murakıb Fırka", *Istikbal*, 19 Teşrinievvel 1340/1924: 1312.

fates in a better way. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that in any single-party regime decisions would be taken by secret meetings and out of the public eye, and that was against democracy. Even though the Party defined itself as the representative of the people, there was a distance between the people and the Party. And he believed that with various political parties, that distance would be eroded. Formation of the multi-party regime would be totally beneficial for the sovereignty of the people.

Faik Ahmet Bey also gave special importance to the party programme of the new political party that could be formed. He had criticised the People's Party's lack of a party programme for a long time. For him, the Party had to leave the primitive partisanship and should become a scientific one with a definite and scientific party programme⁴²⁹. So, for him a programme was a necessity and any opposition party also had to have one. He strongly urged new parties to create definite programmes. According to him, the party programme was the place where the sovereignty of the people could become tangible. Because of that, before the formation of the Party, he started to define the importance of the programme. According to Faik Ahmet Bey, the programme of the new party had to be simple; the sovereignty belongs to the people and every kind of privileges is cancelled⁴³⁰. The people are capable of determining their own fate. The Party had to highlight that it was a party of principles and opinions. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that denominating the Party as Republican wasn't enough. Republic, sovereignty of the people were only titles of a type of regime like kingdom or empire. And it was easy to form a regime of tyranny designated as a republic. The real importance was to establish a real republic and republicanism. And Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the party programme of the new party could be a chance to build a real republic in the country.

Faik Ahmet Bey also said that, as well as the sovereignty of the people, the new party had to include its choice of administrative forms to its programme. The Parties' choice between Centralisation or the people's self-government –*Decentralisation*– had to be mentioned. And together with that the new Party had to define its choice between the principles of the Separation of Powers or Unity of Powers and specify which type

⁴²⁹ Ahmed, Faik, "Muhtaç Olduğumuz Fırka ve İntihab Usülleri", *İstikbal*, 9 Temmuz 1340/1924: 1231.

⁴³⁰ Ahmed, Faik, "Yeni Fırka", *İstikbal*, 13 Teşrinisani 1340/1924: 1333.

was found more suitable for the sovereignty of the people. The programme had to include details about the Party's preference for either the one degree or two degree elections. More importantly, Faik Ahmet Bey insisted that the Party had to declare that it supported the representation of every political ideology and party in the Assembly and protest the People's Parties' interventionism and restrictive attitude. It should openly define that it was against the intervention of the ruling party in elections and the designation of the deputies from the center of the Party.

Faik Ahmet Bey believed that with the formation of a new party, the People's Party would also need to set itself in order. When the new party wrote an actual republican programme, The People's Party would need to reform itself. Even though the Party included "Republican" in the title, for Faik Ahmet Bey, the Party's centralism and the sultanate lived on. The People's Party was supposed to be republican and populist, but actually it was an interventionist party. But with the existence of another party, the People's Party could learn to be respectful to different opinions and political competition. All free citizens should start to join to the political process, and a multi-party regime could be formed⁴³¹. The President should be an independent arbiter who was above the political parties and a real republican regime could be formed. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the new Party was a great opportunity for the country.

4.4.4. FORMATION OF THE PROGRESSIVE PARTY AND FAIK AHMET BEY'S ACTIVE ROLE:

After openly declaring his support for the formation of new political parties Faik Ahmet Bey joined the formation of the Progressive Republican Party. According to him there had to be various parties in the Assembly, and from center to left and to right every ideology had to be represented. According to him, there had to be Progressive Republican, Moderate Republican and Conservative Groups in the Assembly⁴³². A democratic regime could be formed in this way. And he believed that with the emergence of new parties the President would be forced to be neutral to all existing

⁴³¹ Ahmed, Faik, "Yeni Fırka", *Istikbal*, 15 Teşrinisani 1340/1924: 1333.

⁴³² Ahmed, Faik, "Son Haftanın Siyasi Hadiseleri", *Istikbal*, 22 Teşrinisani 1340/1924: 1340.

parties. The People's Party, too, would be forced to be more democratic. Faik Ahmet Bey's ideological belief was closer to the Progressive's and he actively joined the Party's Trabzon Branch.

The roots of the Progressive Party could be traced to the period of rapid change that followed the Abolition of the Sultanate. In this period opposition to Mustafa Kemal Pasha grew rapidly as Unionist elements, ambitious to recover control, liberal constitutionalists committed to the creation of a less centralised and authoritarian system of government, and reactionary elements, opposed to secular reform, sought to exploit the widespread discontent provoked by the authoritarian attitudes of the Kemalist regime⁴³³. The first attempt at opposition to the Pasha occurred in April 1923 when former leaders of the Union and Progress Party Cavid Bey, Dr. Nazım, and Kara Kemal gathered at Cavid Bey's house in Istanbul to consider their position. At this meeting it was agreed that though they would not contest the coming elections and as a political party, they might yet draw up a party programme, including measures to promote greater decentralisation, a double chamber system of government, universal suffrage, equal rights to all Turkish nationals and the preservation of Istanbul as the capital of the Turkish state.

The second attempt came from Mustafa Kemal Pasha's closest collaborators in the national struggle including Rauf, Refet, Ali Fuat Cebesoy and Kazım Karabekir who were fearful that Mustafa Kemal Pasha intended to appoint himself Sultan or impose some other kind of dictatorship. A number of army commanders, former Unionists, political figures and deputies of the People's Party joined them: Dr. Adnan (Adivar), Refet and Rustu Pashas, Ismail Canbulat, Faik, Sabit, Halis Turgut, Zeki, Feridun Fikti and Halit Bey. And in the end on 17 November 1924, the Progressive People's Party was formed⁴³⁴.

After its formation, The New Party organized its local branches in Ankara, Izmir, Istanbul, Sivas and the Eastern provinces. The first Black Sea local branch of the Party was formed in Trabzon and, not surprisingly, it was supported by Faik Ahmet Barutçu and Istikbal Newspaper. Faik Ahmet Bey took a very active role in the

⁴³³ Macfie, A.L., *Atatürk*, (London ; New York : Longman, 1994) 155.

⁴³⁴ Mango, Andrew, *Atatürk*, (London : John Murray, 1999) 418.

formation of the Trabzon Local Branch. When, on 5 January 1924, the central administrative board was constituted, Faik Ahmet Bey became a part of the the board as well as secretary and commissary of the Progressive Party's Trabzon branch⁴³⁵. And the same day as the secretary of the Party, he subjected the corporate records to the governership. This was the first time Faik Ahmet Bey had joined an organization since the end of the SDNR-T.

The Local Branch opened on 23 January 1924, and a public speech has held by the former Trabzon delegate Hafız Mehmet Bey and Faik Ahmet Bey. During the speech Faik Ahmet Bey declared that the formation of a new party was a part of the people's cognition of the law of humanity. And this law became true when the people started to rule themselves. For him, that was real liberty, and he also mentioned that this had started to become a reality in Turkey. Barutçu mentioned his wish for the formation of a principled life; and declared that principles had to be above any personality. He also glorified the new Party's programme, which was based on liberalism and sovereignty of the people.

4.4.5. THE END OF THE ISMET PASHA GOVERNMENT AND THE NEW FETHI BEY CABINET:

The resignations of the eleven deputies continued with resignations by other deputies of the People's Party and the Party crisis became deeper. Strong conflicts over political principles started to emerge in the Party⁴³⁶ and the hardliners continued to create tensions. After it was understood that Mustafa Kemal Pasha wouldn't resign from his duty in the People's Party, Ismet Pasha became the vice chairman. And during those days, the number of deputies who had resigned from the Party reached thirty-two. Four of them were going to be independent, and it became obvious that the remaining twenty-eight would join the Progressive Republican Party⁴³⁷. This was a great crisis for the Party, and in the end Ismet Pasha resigned from his duty and the new Fethi Bey

⁴³⁵ Çapa, Mesut, Faik Ahmet Barutçu, 22.

⁴³⁶ Cebesoy, Ali Fuat, 522.

⁴³⁷ Zürcher, E.J., 80-83.

government was formed on 22 November 1922⁴³⁸. The programme of the government declared that it was going to continue Ismet Pasha's domestic and foreign policy.

According to Faik Ahmet Bey, the source of the crisis in the People's Party was the Ismet Pasha Cabinet⁴³⁹. With the mistaken policies of the Pasha, a group of deputies started to complain about Ismet Pasha. Their hostility reached a level where they even started to question Ismet Pasha's belief in republicanism. According to the opponents, Ismet Pasha was trying to form a tyrannical regime and splits between the deputies started to emerge in the Party. It was a protest against the domination by Ismet Pasha and the partisanship of the People's Party⁴⁴⁰. Faik Ahmet Bey was against the Ismet Pasha government from the beginning. According to him, Ismet Pasha and his government were narrow-minded and his resignation was proof that the People's Party were also tired of his policies. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the Ismet Pasha government was a weak committee, which wasn't actually respected by the Assembly⁴⁴¹. It was a government formed by the personal power of the Pasha from the insignificant deputies. More than the Assembly's confidence, those deputies were determined to get the support of the leaders of the Party. Ismet Pasha thus lost his personal capital and his cabinet lost confidence. Within the Party the same deputies always joined the cabinets and became ministers, and a class of privileged deputies was created in the Assembly. All of this increased hostilities in the Assembly and forced Ismet Pasha to resign and a new cabinet was formed.

Faik Ahmet Bey's early reaction to Fethi Bey was negative. He believed that Fethi Bey cabinet was going to continue Ismet Pasha's policies with the same cadres of the People's Party⁴⁴². For him it was a cabinet formed with an intention; it was formed in order to blind the opposition inside the Party, and it would be dim and short-lived. The Assembly would be forced to give a vote of confidence. He believed that Fethi Bey could reverse Ismet Pasha's dictatorial policies, and he could give more authority to the assembly. But when the Progressive Republican Party defined its support to the Fethi Bey cabinet, Faik Ahmet Bey's attitude changed.

⁴³⁸ Orbay, Rauf, *Siyasi Hatıralar*, 516.

⁴³⁹ Ahmed, Faik, "Zoraki İtimad", *İstikbal*, 10 Teşrinisani 1340/1924:1331.

⁴⁴⁰ Ahmed, Faik, "Bugünkü İctima", *İstikbal*, 28 Teşrinievvel 1340/1924: 1320

⁴⁴¹ Ahmed, Faik, "Kabinenin Tebeddülü", *İstikbal*, 24 Teşrinisani 1340/1924:1341.

⁴⁴² Ahmed, Faik, "Yeni Kabine", *İstikbal*, 24 Teşrinisani 1340/1924: 1342.

From the beginning, the Progressive Party welcomed Fethi Bey's government. According to Rauf Orbay, replacement of Ismet Pasha by Fethi Bey was a major shift in the political scene. It was a structural change in the mentality of the country⁴⁴³. Orbay believed that Fethi Bey's political life depended on liberties and the defence of law and order. Faik Ahmet Bey also responded to the formation of the Fethi Bey Government in the same way. According to him, Fethi Bey was above the narrow-mindedness of the People's Party who ruled the country like a hereditary monarchy⁴⁴⁴. Ismet Pasha had created a crisis in the Party with his partisan cabinet; because of his cabinet, the People's Party faced the danger of dissolution. The Party had to sacrifice Ismet Pasha in order to exist, and gave the authority to Fethi Bey, who was respected by all. Fethi Bey gathered all the enlightened and broad-minded cadres of the Peoples Party, and formed a new government in order to save the Party. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that, because of this, the Fethi Bey Government gained the support of the Progressive Party and the independent conservatives during its formation. Fethi Bey's government was entirely different from Ismet Pasha's. According to Faik Ahmet Bey, Ismet Pasha's ultimate aim was to make himself amiable to the most devoted and monopolist section of the People's Party and to lean on their power. Ismet Pasha wanted to create a privileged class in the Party and placed the State administration in their hands. Ismet Pasha wanted that class to rule the country according to their desires and wills. In this way the Assembly and its authorities were disregarded, and attempts made to annul its power. In the end deputies started to voice their complaints and mention that they had no faith in Ismet Pasha's republicanism⁴⁴⁵. His policy failed and he was forced to resign. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that because of Ismet Pasha's policy a great number of deputies left the Party. And it would continue if he didn't resign. It became a must for the Party to ask Fethi Bey to form a new government, because he was trusted and respected by all the deputies. Ismet Pasha's departure became necessary because of the rising opposition.

Faik Ahmet Bey hoped that Fethi Bey would act for the benefit of the whole Party and act against the monopolists. He stated that because the monopolists knew this

⁴⁴³ Orbay, Rauf, *Siyasi Hatıralar*, 520.

⁴⁴⁴ Ahmed, Faik "Kabineye İtimad", *İstikbal*, 1 Kanunievvel 1340/1924:1346.

⁴⁴⁵ Ahmed, Faik "Kabinenin Tebdili", *İstikbal*, 24 Teşrinisani 1340/1924: 1341.

would happen, they protested against Fethi Bey at the last meeting of the Party, and warned him not to be tolerant with the opposition. But Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the hostility of the monopolists to Fethi Bey made Fethi Bey more powerful and able to gain the support of the opposition. Faik Ahmet Bey also believed that the Fethi Bey cabinet would be beneficial for the new party. The new party should show that they were ready to support a government which was truly republican and against the monopolists. By doing so, the new party would prove its belief in the republican regime and democracy⁴⁴⁶. According to him, Fethi Bey was going to rely on the opposition in the same way and he was going to be respectful to the new party and the freedom of the press. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that Fethi Bey was going to be a permissive prime minister because of his respect for democracy⁴⁴⁷.

4.4.6. THE PARTY PROGRAMME OF THE PROGRESSIVE PARTY:

The Progressive Republican Party's party programme is still a very controversial issue. Many different opinions have been expressed about the programme. According to Falih Rıfkı Atay, the programme had a significance which was beyond the personal conflicts or personal greed, and he defined it as a significant programme with its own particular ideology. Zürcher defined the programme as a part of the 19th century liberal political thought tradition whose effects could be seen from Locke to Rousseau and to the French Revolution. Zürcher's evaluation was the closest to Faik Ahmet Bey's, he was also sure that the Programme was strictly a liberalist one. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the New Party's programme was openly formed through liberal principles consistent with public opinion. It was a liberalist programme for him.

From the beginning Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the new party programme would support liberties and the sovereignty of the people. It was going to be a truly republican programme and the Progressive Party would be the first party formed under the republican regime with a political programme. The Party Programme was therefore discussed at length by Faik Ahmet Bey. According to him, the Programme was more

⁴⁴⁶ Ahmed, Faik, "Yeni Kabine", *Istikbal*, 25 Teşrinisani 1340/1924: 1342.

⁴⁴⁷ Ahmed, Faik, "Bir Müşahede", 10 Kanunievvel 1339/1924: 1354.

important than any other aspect of the New Party and he was glad that the New Party was not like the People's Party, which didn't have a political programme or political ideology. For Faik Ahmet Bey, that was the most significant difference between the two Parties⁴⁴⁸. And he believed that the existence of the new party was going to push the People's Party to own a programme.

For Faik Ahmet Bey, the formation of a new party, which had a strict programme and followed political ideas, and its existence on the Assembly, was a major contribution to the political life of the country and good for its citizens. He also believed that without any control mechanisms and checks and balances, the emergence of a tyranny was inevitable. So he believed that in a democratic republic, control mechanisms were essential for political life. The executive branch of the State power had to be controlled, and it was obvious that in a single-party regime that control could not be supplied and sovereignty of the people lost its significance. Under the single-party regime, the right to rule given to the people by the principle of the sovereignty of the people, which was represented on the Assembly, was used by a party commission with force. As a result of this, a tyrannical regime and sultanate of a single-party regime was formed. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that with the new party and its programme, a control body could be formed in the Assembly. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the party programme was capable of controlling the majority party. And, more than with the general spirit of the Programme, Faik Ahmet Bey was concerned with the technical details and the parts concerning the mechanisms of democracy and the functioning of the system.

Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the programme would gain the support of the people. For him, the programme was significantly liberal and gave a large space to public liberties, and demanding the formation of a real republican regime. The first thirteen articles of the Party's programme were about those principles, and Faik Ahmet Bey especially evaluated those. Faik Ahmet Bey referred to the new party programme as a libertarian one. According to him, the programme was formed around two common principles; liberalism and sovereignty of the people. Around the principle of liberalism, the Party openly declared its support to the public liberties and supported the protection

⁴⁴⁸ Ahmed, Faik, "Yeni Fırkanın Programı", *Istikbal*, 2 Kanunievvel 1340/1924: 1347.

of the legal rights of the people against the State power. According to Faik Ahmet Bey, the new party openly declared its rejection of the suspension of public liberties and opposed laws contrary to the people's liberties. The programme mentioned that the people's liberties were a problem in the constitution and that public approval of any law had to be obtained: an ordinary assembly shouldn't make those changes. He also supported the programme's liberal views about the State. The programme's ninth article mentioned that State power had to be limited⁴⁴⁹. But he found the programme less liberalist than it should have been. First of all, Faik Ahmet Bey declared that he shared the same liberalist ideas about state power. The State was a body of public services, and its powers had to be limited to the minimum necessary. The State had to supply internal law and order and protect the country against foreign enemies. But according to him, the new party could not openly go that far. They identified the role of the state in economy, social life and administration on their programme. But no matter what, it was obvious that the programme, in general, showed its support for wide public liberties⁴⁵⁰.

On domestic politics, the programme supported administrative decentralization and on the level of local administration it asked for the participation of the people in the administration through local committees. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the people were capable of ruling themselves, and that was the ultimate aim of the Anatolian Revolution. Together with State power, the people should rule their own districts and form their own self-rule. The fifteenth, sixteenth and twentieth articles of the programme promised the laying down of rules in that way. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that what was promised by the Party had to be administered. The existing centralist system was a remnant of the old regime and an enemy of progress and improvement.

According to Faik Ahmet Bey, the Progressive Party's Programme openly declared its support for the superiority of the Assembly above any other power and defined the Assembly as the ultimate representative of the sovereignty of the people. He was glad that the New Party openly declared the Superiority of the Assembly. According to the new programme, the Progressive Party demanded the unchangeable and nondelegable and unpunishable sovereignty and the reining in of the Assembly. And the

⁴⁴⁹ Zürcher, E.J., *The Progressive Republican Party*, 99.

⁴⁵⁰ Ahmed, Faik, *Terakkiperver Cumhuriyet Fırkası'nın Programı*, *Istikbal*, 4 Kanunievvel 1340/1924: 1349.

Party requested respect for this principle. Faik Ahmet Bey also supported the objection of the Programme to the veto right given to the President, his right to send the accepted legislative proposal back to the Assembly for redebating, and his right to dismiss the Assembly⁴⁵¹. The twelfth and thirteenth articles of the Programme were about those topics. Faik Ahmet Bey was clearly pleased about the Programme's rejection of the President's excessive rights. Those excessive rights were the right to veto, right to dismiss the Assembly and send accepted laws back to the Assembly for re-discussion. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that those Presidential rights were against the separation of powers and the superiority of the Assembly. And the twelfth article of the programme, which rejected them, was absolutely right for him. The Progressive Party asked the end of the deputyship of the President when elected. For Faik Ahmet Bey, those were signs that the Party was demanding real separation of powers and the Assembly's leadership of the State. This was the main difference between the People's Party and the New Party for Faik Ahmet Bey. The People's Party wanted to form a regime based on the President, who had extraordinary authorities, while The Progressive Party wanted a regime based on the superiority of the Assembly. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the People's Party was also against the neutrality of the President from political parties and wanted the President to be chairman of the Party. The Progressive Party's programme openly showed its rejection to that.

For Faik Ahmet Bey, one of the other important articles was the one, which mentioned that constitutional changes could not be made without the assent and attorneyship of the people. That was the fifth article of the programme. For Faik Ahmet Bey, a constitution was the basis of the state structure and there had to be regulations and rules for its change. If constitution changes were made frequently, political crises would occur. Ordinary assemblies should not make changes; only a constituent assembly. Any modern republican regime had regulations over the process and in Turkey, Faik Ahmet Bey believed that when making amendments, the people's approval and attorneyship had to be asked. Without the people's approval no change could be made. For Faik Ahmet Bey, with that article in the programme the Progressive Party fulfilled a necessary requirement of democracy.

⁴⁵¹ Ahmed, Faik, Yeni Fırkanın Programı –II-, Istikbal, 3 Kanunievvel 1340/1924: 1348.

The Progressive Party programme was strongly against suffrage indirect, and requested the formation of the direct suffrage system⁴⁵². The eight article of the programme was about the electoral system. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that suffrage indirect had to also include the local governments. For him the real representation of the people could be secured only after that. And he believed that in a republican regime based on the sovereignty of the people, suffrage indirect had no place. For a regime of the sovereignty of the people, direct suffrage was a must. But that was not enough for Faik Ahmet Bey; he believed that every political opinion and idea had to be represented on the Assembly and so a system of proportional representation had to be created. The executive power could be better checked and the domination of the single-party regime could be ended. Faik Ahmet Bey asked the Progressive Republican Party to add proportional representation to its programme⁴⁵³.

The fourth and seventh articles of the programme were about public and individual liberties and the protection of individual entrepreneurship.⁴⁵⁴ According to Faik Ahmet Bey, those articles were very important. He believed that the most important problem of the country was the unjust protection and nepotism of one class over the society and the free individual. He believed that in order to protect that class's position, laws and public liberties were violated⁴⁵⁵. That ruling class created a politics of protection, which could not be broken easily. They controlled the country in every aspect, and the individual was powerless against them. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that, the existing social and political order of protection was supplied by the State power and the individual's abilities and entrepreneurship were left undefended. The Party's power was always hanging over them. To make an economical or political decision, individuals always had to ask for the protection of the ruling Party. The articles of the Progressive Party, however, put individual liberties above the Party's power. The Progressive Party also declared that it was against control by small factions in national politics and specified that every decision had to be taken according to the principle of majority vote. And they mentioned that in order to avoid the power of the small

⁴⁵² Zürcher, E.J., *The Progressive Republican Party*, 100-102

⁴⁵³ Ahmed, Faik, *Yeni Fırkanın Programı –II-, İstikbal*, 3 Kanunievvel 1340/1924: 1348.

⁴⁵⁴ Zürcher, E.J., *The Progressive Republican Party*, 99.

⁴⁵⁵ Ahmed, Faik, "Yeni Fırkanın Programı", *İstikbal*, 2 Kanunievvel 1340/1924: 1347.

factions, every decision inside the country had to be taken by authorized committees with majority voting. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the politics of small factions always led to regimes of tyranny. Even revolutions could turn out to be violators of liberties and sovereignty of the people, and the revolution could turn out to be a freehold property of a small faction; in the end they would force everyone in society to think like themselves. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the new party was sufficiently opposed to the authority of small factions who used their power against the people.

Concerning the political results of the party programme, more than short-term effects, Faik Ahmet Bey was interested in the long-term effects. According to him the programme of the Progressive Party would affect the People's Party, and in the long-term the Party would improve itself with moderation and virtuousness⁴⁵⁶ Faik Ahmet Bey believed that it was inevitable that the moderate members of the Party would be impressed by the Progressive program and would eventually transform the People's Party. After the declaration of the Progressive programme, the People's Party immediately declared its support for direct suffrage. It would start, step by step, to become more democratic.

4.4.7. MUSTAFA KEMAL PASHA'S REACTION TO THE FORMATION OF THE NEW PARTY:

After the formation of the Progressive Republican Party, Mustafa Kemal Pasha made his first comments about the Party on 11 January 1924. It was an interview with the *The Times'* Istanbul reporter Maxwell Macartney. In the interview the Pasha mentioned that there were no great differences between the two parties, and also added that with the existence of other parties a republican regime, based on sovereignty of the people, was strengthened⁴⁵⁷. Zürcher writes that, more than a message of support, the interview was a tactical move to reduce political tensions. Under this policy of rapprochement, the Pasha was also trying to consolidate his political support base.

⁴⁵⁶ Ahmed, Faik, "Programa Dair", *Istikbal*, 6 Kanunievvel 1340/1924: 1350.

⁴⁵⁷ Zürcher, E.J., *The Progressive Party*, 100.

Faik Ahmet Bey's evaluation was similar to Zürcher's. According to him, it was obvious that the Pasha could make supportive statements about the formation of the Party and, indeed, anything else could not be expected. The Pasha's statement about the programme was normal; he was trying to content the people. The Party's relations with the free press were in crisis and the Pasha was trying to show the people how libertarian he was in reality⁴⁵⁸. But Faik Ahmet Bey believed that beneath the surface some deeper plans were going on. It became obvious when the Pasha declared that, together with the Presidency, he would continue to be chairman of the People's Party. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the real meaning of this statement was an admission that the Pasha couldn't be neutral to the new party. If he really wanted to be neutral, he could resign from The People's Party and its chairmanship. Even though the Pasha said that now he wasn't interested in the party chairmanship, when political struggles intensified he could use his authority as the Chairman of the Party and as the President, thereby becoming involved in party struggles.

Faik Ahmet Bey believed that there were much deeper plans on the Pasha's behalf. According to him, the Pasha was trying to cover the People's Party's lack of political programme through The Progressive Republican Party. Mustafa Kemal Pasha declared that the People's Party's programme was the same as the new party's. For Faik Ahmet Bey, through the Progressive Party's programme Mustafa Kemal Pasha was trying to present the People's Party as a follower of liberal and democratic ideas. The Progressive Party's programme openly supported the liberties and the sovereignty of the people and it was liberal and democratic. If it came to power it would form a liberal and democratic regime⁴⁵⁹. When the Pasha said that the two programmes were similar, the People's Party appeared to share the same ideals as the Progressive Party. But it was not convincing.

⁴⁵⁸ Ahmed, Faik, "Gazi'nin Beyanati", Istikbal, 14 Kanunievvel 1340/1924: 1357.

⁴⁵⁹ Ahmed, Faik, "Gazi'nin Beyanati", Istikbal, 14 Kanunievvel 1340/1924: 1357.

4.4.8. THE BYELECTIONS OF 1924:

At the end of the 1924, byelections took place in Istanbul, Bursa and Izmir. Coming so quickly after the split in the Assembly and the founding of the Progressive Party, these byelections were seen as the first major test of the opposition's strength. But the Party's organization was not yet in place and the electoral system in Turkey was indirect one: in byelections it was not the electorate as such, but the electors who would cast their votes⁴⁶⁰. After long debates of candidates, Progressive Party did not put a candidate of its own in the İstanbul elections, Ali İhsan Pasha (Sabis), famous general and arch-enemy of Mustafa Kemal Pasha, was the main opposition candidate, He stood as an independent and, but was considered to be close to the Progressive Party. He lost the election to the government candidate.

From the beginning of the election Faik Ahmet Bey mentioned his disbelief in the neutrality of the Government and the People's Party. For him, in theory a republican regime shouldn't interfere in the free elections of the people. During the Second Constitutional Monarchy those interventions had occurred, and with the declaration of the republican regime the structure of elections had to change. But in reality Faik Ahmet Bey thought that no real changes occurred after the revolution. The mentality and the praxis of the Sultanate era were still in place in the new regime⁴⁶¹. Faik Ahmet Bey warned that the Government would interfere in the people's free vote and sovereignty. It was obvious that the Party was going to win the elections, because all the state power was used for the Party's success. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that Governors were forcing the people to vote for the People's Party⁴⁶² and that they had also assigned some of the candidates according to their own will. They even rejected some of the Party's candidates. The Party's candidates could easily win with this backing. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the whole election was corrupt. The best example of this corruption was in Kırşehir. Even though the People's Party assigned Müfid Bey as the candidate; the Governor of Kırşehir assigned Sıdkı Efendi. According to Faik Ahmet Bey all these incidents were against the will of the people and it showed that nothing had actually

⁴⁶⁰ Zürcher, E.J, The Progressive Republican Party, 65.

⁴⁶¹ Ahmed, Faik, "Son İntihablar", *Istikbal*, 15 Kanunievvel 1340/1924: 1358.

⁴⁶² Ahmed, Faik, "İntihab ve İtimad", *Istikbal*, 25 Kanunievvel 1340/1924, No: 1362

changed after the Revolution. The new regime still didn't allow the sovereignty of the people and tried to block it⁴⁶³. But Faik Ahmet Bey was sure that the people would reject the interference by the government, and this happened in the Bursa election.

The byelection in Bursa was problematic. Sakallı Nurettin Pasha, a hero of the independence war and a religious reactionary, won the elections as an independent. The Progressive Party welcomed his success but Sakallı Nurettin Pasha's ideology was very different from that of the Progressive Party. Because of this, the Progressives said that he could join the party, but only if he accepted the party programme⁴⁶⁴. His election didn't receive a warm welcome from the People's Party. Even the Anatolian Agency didn't report his success and the parliamentary faction of the party declared his election void on the grounds that Nurettin had not resigned from the army in sufficient time before the election. A new election was held in Bursa and Nurettin won it again. For Faik Ahmet Bey the incident was a repetition of the suppression policy of the People's Party. The Party and its deputies had the right to disapprove of the Pasha's ideas and political career. But he was freely elected by the people⁴⁶⁵ and the People's Party rejected his election because he was not a candidate of their Party. If he had been the candidate of the Party nobody would have rejected him. The Party wanted to gain total control over all the candidates. But Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the parliament needed independent deputies who had liberal ideas and a free conscience. Even though he was a religious reactionary, that didn't necessarily mean that he was an enemy of progress. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that his military duty was used as an excuse by the Party because there were other members of the army on the Assembly. According to the laws, Nurettin Pasha had to make a choice between the army and deputyship. Faik Ahmet bey believed that because he was not a member of the People's Party, the Party raised difficulties over his deputyship. Nurettin Pasha didn't have to be a member of the People's Party or the Progressive Party, but he was the elected deputy of the people. The people's choice should not be interfered with and the result of the election had to be accepted⁴⁶⁶. The free will of the people was a part of republican ideals.

⁴⁶³ Ahmed, Faik, "Halkın Uyanıklığı", Istikbal, 18 Kanunievvel 1340/1924: 1360.

⁴⁶⁴ E.J. Zürcher, *The ProgressiveRepublican Party*, 67.

⁴⁶⁵ Ahmed, Faik, "İtiraz Hazırlığı", Istikbal, 29 Kanunievvel 1340/1924: 1368.

⁴⁶⁶ Ahmed, Faik, "Bursa İntihabı", Istikbal, 23 Kanunievvel 1340/1924: 1363.

Faik Ahmet Bey also criticised the elections held in Gümüşhane. According to him, the governor of Gümüşhane also violated the free will of the people by counting the votes of the People's Party and clearing the rest. There was no Government inquiry. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that all these illegal attacks occurred due to the electoral system. He also criticised the suffrage indirect system used in the election. According to him, the electoral system was against the will of the people. The second electorate was a method used in the Sultanate era which had to be abolished in favour of suffrage direct. Until that time, the people's sovereignty would be trampled on. If the people couldn't defend their rights, the violations would continue⁴⁶⁷.

4.5. 1925 POLITICAL EVENTS AND THE END OF THE FAIK AHMET BEY ARTICLES:

4.5.1. THE CRISIS BETWEEN RECEP BEY AND FETHI BEY:

The formation of the Progressive Party created a crisis in the People's Party. Thirty-two deputies resigned from the Party leading up to 22 November 1924. The crises continued with the resignation of the Ismet Pasha Government on the same day. And after the resignation, Fethi Bey was appointed as the new Prime Minister and charged with forming the new government. But Fethi Bey's appointment dissatisfied the hardliners of the Party. He was perceived as too passive a figure to rule the country, and his political attitude was seen too close to the Progressive Party. The Progressive Party saw Fethi Bey as closer to themselves. In the end two factions (hardliners and moderates) appeared in the Party. The hardliners asked for rigorous measures such as the imposition of martial law against the opposition and the Istanbul newspapers. The hardliners were led by the Minister of the Interior of the Fethi Bey Cabinet, Recep Bey (Peker).

Under these conditions, partial elections were held which ended at the end of the January. The Progressive Party did not join the elections. After that, the voice of the hardliners in the People's Party gained volume. Fethi Bey was accused of being too

⁴⁶⁷ Ahmed, Faik, "Hakkı Müdafaa", *Istikbal*, 1 Kanunisani 1341/1925: 1370.

moderate and slowing the revolutions. According to the hardliners, Fethi Bey wasn't a revolutionary and his policy was pacifist. The crisis deepened over the problem of the local administration of Istanbul. Fethi Bey demanded a free election for the Istanbul municipality. But it was strongly refused by Recep Bey and his colleagues. Recep Bey demanded strong measures be taken against Istanbul⁴⁶⁸. Later on the crisis became a Recep Bey-Fethi Bey problem.

For Faik Ahmet Bey, it was obvious that the main reactions and hostilities to Fethi Bey would come from his own Party. A section of the members of the Party were in conflict with Fethi Bey and his cabinet, and it was deeper than it seemed. It was the hardliners controlled by Ismet Pasha. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that, more than a conflict of ideas and opinions, the struggle was a competitive show of strength and authority inside the Party. The hardliners were uncomfortable with the rising opposition and felt that they were losing their power. Until Recep Bey's resignation, they showed their resistance to the opposition secretly. And they didn't want the impression of being opposed to a mixed cabinet between the hardliners and moderates. But they changed their policy and started to openly attack Fethi Bey. And the local administration problem was only a blind excuse for the hardliners to create a crisis and to wrest power from Fethi Bey⁴⁶⁹. Recep Bey's resignation was planned in order to create a cabinet crisis and Faik Ahmet Bey believed that behind Recep Bey there was the President's support. Recep Bey was only mentioning President's views. And nothing different could be expected. But Recep Bey's resignation was suspicious. It was not just a cabinet crisis. According to Faik Ahmet Bey, Recep Bey's resignation was a sign of deeper conflicts in the Party.

There was a subbranch inside the Party, who wanted to come into power and they were trying to corrode Fethi Bey's cabinet. The hardliners were the colleagues of Ismet Pasha and they wanted to end Fethi Bey's political power. The first Fethi Bey cabinet was ended by their efforts, and they came into power under Ismet Pasha's protection. But their power decreased with the end of the Ismet Pasha Cabinet. The subbranch was now trying to regain power from Fethi Bey. It came into power, under

⁴⁶⁸ Cebesoy, Ali Fuat, *Siyasi Hatıralar*, 516-524.

⁴⁶⁹ Ahmed, Faik, "Recep Bey'in İstifası, *İstikbal*, 6 Kanunısani 1341/1925: 1374.

the leadership of Kazım Pasha and the main action came from Recep Bey. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that his resignation was in order to overthrow Fethi Bey Cabinet, and re-take the Government⁴⁷⁰. Recep Bey was one of the significant leaders of the hardliner subbranch inside the Party. Ismet Pasha's support for him was obvious; he was appointed as the general secretary of the Party. And the blind excuse of conflict over the local administration ended all of a sudden. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that more crises were waiting the People's Party and that the hardliners' ambition would never end.

4.5.2 PROGRESSIVE PARTY - PEOPLE'S PARTY RELATIONS:

Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the bifurcation in the People's Party between the hardliners and moderates brought the moderates closer to the Progressive Party as the moderate branch of the Party began to interact with Progressives. The Progressives also preferred the Fethi Bey Cabinet and demonstrated this. The reason for the bifurcation was the lack of a party programme in the People's Party. As a result, members of the Party divided into two subbranches and their principles diverged from each other. Because of the lack of a party programme which included a guideline for political, administrative, economic and political spheres and because the People's Party wasn't a party of political currents, Faik Ahmet Bey believed that detachments from the Party would always occur. And the Party would always face disagreements and bifurcations between members over political incidents. Faik Ahmet Bey expounded that a branch of the Government and the People's Party became closer to Progressive Party and that it mainly occurred among the supporters of Fethi Bey. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that Recep Peker and his group demanded an absolutist regime and this was the real branch which was against the Progressive Party and the freedom of the people. Fethi Bey and his supporters were more democratic and they supported liberties and the people's sovereignty⁴⁷¹.

According to Faik Ahmet Bey, after the formation of the Progressive Party, the People's Party couldn't become a homogenous political group and its demands for

⁴⁷⁰ Ahmed, Faik, "Buhran İhtimalleri", *Istikbal*, 13 Kanunısani 1341/1925: 1379.

⁴⁷¹ Ahmed, Faik, "Merkeziyet Çenberi", *Istikbal*, 15 Kanunısani 1341/1925: 1380.

centralism continued. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the differences between the two parties were evident in their views on the municipalities. The People's Party demanded a central administration of the government over the municipalities. And the Party abstained from the people's self-administration and election over the local administrations thus continuing the understanding of the *ancien regime*. The sovereignty of the people and the people's right to self-administration were disregarded thus. But the Progressive Party supported real democracy and republicanism and the people's rule. The Progressives demanded the self-ruling of the people over the provincial administration by free elections. And they openly showed their hostility to the pressure of the district governor, governor of a province and gendarmes over the people. And they protested the interference by the Ministry of the Interior to the local administrators. For Faik Ahmet Bey The Progressive Republican Parties' struggle against the centralism of the Party and the government was the most significant proof of the Parties' belief in democracy and republicanism.

Faik Ahmet Bey also mentioned the rising hostility within the People's Party to the emergence of the New Party. Faik Ahmet stated that a spirit of hostility and partisanship occurred in the People's Party after the formation of the Progressive Party. According to him, after the formation of the new party, aspersions and even defamation started to emerge about the opponent deputies who resigned in order to form a new party. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that in the end it turned out to be a race of loyalty. The most blaspheming deputies were accepted as the most loyal ones to the People's Party⁴⁷² and the Party leaders applauded them. The Ankara delegate Ihsa Bey, in particular, started to shout during Party meetings that they could not give the government to the new party, asking the Party leadership and the Prime Minister to stop resignations from the Party. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the Party was damaging itself within these acts. And with the partisan spirit of the Party, the Antalya delegate Rasih Efendi, who demanded the Party not publish the slurs on the opponents, was forcibly silenced.

Faik Ahmet Bey also argued that after the formation of the new party and the resignations, the People's Party started to demand a paper loyalty oath and signature

⁴⁷² Ahmed, Faik, "Fırka Müzakeresinde", *Istikbal*, 28 Teşrinisani 1340/1924: 1344.

from its members following a decision taken by the party council⁴⁷³. After the formation of the New Party, the loyalty of its members was under suspicion, and Mustafa Kemal Pasha expressed his fear that he might find himself in a minority⁴⁷⁴. According to the Faik Ahmet Bey, the Party was trying to supply the loyalty of its members through these new methods of suppression and trying to stop new resignations. The ultimate aim of the Party was to create stability by creating a completely loyal member structure. The People's Party was trying to transform into a Party of members who had all taken a loyalty oath. But Faik Ahmet Bey asked the question of loyalty; to whom or to which principles were the members asked to take an oath of loyalty? It was not an oath made about the Party's principles, because the People's Party had no strict political programme or principles. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that solidarity could only be achieved around political principles, not by oaths of loyalty. And it was obvious that a paper could not stop resignations. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that only when a spirit of democracy was achieved in the Party would its members' loyalty be secure. These methods of domination over the members were useless.

Faik Ahmet Bey believed that all these reactions occurred in the People's Party because the Party believed that its rule should be eternal. The Party was hostile to the suggestion that it could share power with the New Party. And he also believed that these kind of approaches could only occur in the ancien regime political systems which depended on divine law and hereditary monarchy. But what brought the People's Party into power was the people, and it was the people who could take it from the Party and give it to another one. The People's Party had no right to act as if their power was hereditary and they could run the country forever⁴⁷⁵. Even though the republican regime had now been founded, for Faik Ahmet Bey the People's Party's dreams of tyranny and despotism continued. And the people were estranged and alienated from the Party because of that. Faik Ahmet Bey mentioned that if the People's Party went go that way, its relations with the people would suffer even more. The Party had to learn to compete with rival parties in terms of political ideas.

⁴⁷³ Ahmed, Faik, "Sadakat İmzası", *Istikbal*, 27 Kanunısani 1340/1924: 1366.

⁴⁷⁴ Mango, Andrew, Atatürk, 418.

⁴⁷⁵ Ahmed, Faik, "Fırka Müzakeresinde", *Istikbal*, 28 Teşrinisani 1340/1924: 1344.

In December 1924 a new discussion about the establishment of a Navy Ministry started and at the same time various proposals were made to separate the army from political life. But the ultimate aim was to end the military life of the Pasha's who had joined the Progressive Party⁴⁷⁶. The Erzurum delegate Rüştü Pasha gave a legislative offer to Assmsembly about the resignation of the deputies from their military duties. Faik Ahmet Bey took the opportunity to declare his own thoughts about the role of the army in politics.

4.5.3. CLOSING DOWN OF *THE TOKSÖZ* NEWSPAPER:

With the opposition movements gaining momentum, Faik Ahmet Bey knew that the People's Party was going to clamp down on the opposition. During early 1925 Faik Ahmet Bey felt a new wave of pressure was coming and he wrote several articles. According to him the People's Party wanted to go back to the strict regulations of the Sultanate, and in terms of the freedom of the press even the relative freedom given by the Second Constitutional became too much for the Party⁴⁷⁷. The rights given to the free press by the Sultanate era were begrudged by the republican regime. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that this situation was deplorable; a republican regime had to fight for further rights of freedom of speech, freedom of conscience, free debates and liberties. But what was being attempted was just the contrary, the new "republican" regime demanded to silence the press. For him it was obvious that the hardliners of the People's Party still didn't understand the real meaning of a republic, and they were its worst enemies. They only wanted freedom for their supporters, but the meaning of the republic was further liberties for everone. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that those policies of the People's Party were only strengthening the Progressive Party and its liberalist program.

The first wave came with the legislative proposal given by Ali Saip Bey (delegate of Kozan)⁴⁷⁸. Ali Saip Bey demanded an amendement of the existing Press Law and asked for new restrictions against the press. For Faik Ahmet Bey it was obvious that Ali Saip Bey was a symbol of the general tone prevalent in the People's

⁴⁷⁶ Çakan, *Türk Parlamento Tarihinde İkinci Meclis*, 188.

⁴⁷⁷ Ahmed, Faik, "Matbuatın Takyidi", *İstikbal*, 7 Kanunievvel 1341/1925: 1351.

⁴⁷⁸ Ali Saip Bey was a coming member of the Independence Court of the insurrection territory. (Tunçay 148).

Party. The Party wanted to form a new autocracy and it was a betrayal of the freedom struggle and it was acting in a reactionary (irticai) way. The reactionism of the Party was much worse than that coming from below, from the society. The Party was assassinating the republican ideals while it was trying to form a republican regime⁴⁷⁹.

The pressure of the Government against the opposition movement continued with the closing down of another opposition newspaper, the *Toksöz*. And Faik Ahmet Bey's prediction came true once more. The *Toksöz* newspaper was published by another opposition figure, Abdülkadir Kemali Bey. It was published in İstanbul and Adana and starting from 30 August 1924, it reflected its adverse views on the new regime⁴⁸⁰. With the rising hostility of the new regime to the opposition, it was closed down by order of the Government on 30 January 1924. The Government and Mustafa Kemal Pasha feared the rising opposition movement. *Toksöz*'s publication policy and its arguments were very close to those of *Istikbal*⁴⁸¹. After the closing down, many different responses came from various newspapers. The decision was protested by Fevzi Lütfi Bey of the *Son Telgraf*, Velid Ebbuziya Bey of *Tevhid-i Efkar* and Hüseyin Cahit Bey of *Tanin* Newspaper⁴⁸². Abdülkadir Kemali Bey was tried and sentenced to imprisonment for six months on 12 January 1925. Because the closing down also concerned Faik Ahmet Bey, he also protested the incident. And his last articles in *Istikbal* Newspaper were about the incident of *Toksöz* and Abdülkadir Kemali Bey. After those articles Faik Ahmet Bey didn't write any more articles after the closing of the *Istikbal* Newspaper⁴⁸³.

As well as *Toksöz*, an English Newspaper printed in İstanbul, *the Orient News* was also closed down. Faik Ahmet Bey considered the closing down of the English Newspaper a correct decision. It was a foreign newspaper, which had to respect Turkish laws and borders. It shouldn't interfere with Turkish domestic affairs. But his attitude towards *Toksöz* was just the contrary. Faik Ahmet Bey strongly objected to the decision to close it down. *Toksöz* was a Turkish newspaper and it had the right to state its opinion. This was a reminder of the suppression of the free press during the Sultanate

⁴⁷⁹ Ahmed, Faik, "Hürriyet-i Matbuat", *Istikbal*, 8 Kanunievvel 1341/1925: 1352.

⁴⁸⁰ Demirel, Meral, *Tam Bir Muhalif Abdülkadir Kemali Bey*. (İstanbul: İ.Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2006) 166.

⁴⁸¹ Demirel 165-201.

⁴⁸² Demirel 208-220.

⁴⁸³ Çapa, Mesut, Faik Ahmet Bey, 88.

era⁴⁸⁴. It was an arbitrary decision taken by the Government in order to silence the free press. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that Toksöz's publications were consistent with the revolutions, republicanism and sovereignty of the people. But it was criticizing the policies of the Government. The 19th article of the Press Law, which was against aspersion and defamation was used against Toksöz but for Faik Ahmet Bey, the problem was beyond the law. It was a problem of the regime and its attitude towards a free society. The point was that the Government and the existing Press Law was maintaining the repressive policies of the Sultanate era.

According to Faik Ahmet Bey, the decision to imprison Abdülkadir Kemali Bey's was taken because the Government interfered in the trial and put pressure on the court. And he believed that until the day that the courts could take free decisions without any external interference, those kinds of misjudgements would continue. For Faik Ahmet Bey the interference of the Government was damaging the rule of law and public liberties and laws and jurisprudence were disappearing. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that after these incidents there was nothing to stop the rising despotism. Society would abandon its peace, security and stability before the power of the State. The power and penetration of the State over society had reached a dangerous level.

For him many different reactions came from the various groups and the Turkish Press. Toksöz was defined as a newspaper which had violated the laws of the country and threatened the domestic and foreign security of the state. And newspapers supporting the government were pleased with the punishment handed out by the court following a martial law model. These newspapers were paid by the government for their support.

For Faik Ahmet Bey the significance of the incident was beyond supporting any newspaper. It was fundamentally about the freedom of the Press in Turkey. What should be protected were the republican ideals and the natural rights of the people. They had to be protected against the government. For him, the government was supposed to be republican, but it was violating republican ideals. The republic was a regime of the highest ethical ideals of the law of humanity. And a free society, which accepted those ideals, had to reject the decision⁴⁸⁵.

⁴⁸⁴ Ahmed, Faik, "Vaziyette Bir Nazar", *Istikbal*, 5 Teşrinisani 1924: 1329.

⁴⁸⁵ Ahmed, Faik "Hakikate Temas", *Istikbal*, 11 Kanunısani 1341/1925: 1378.

Faik Ahmet Bey believed that there would always be a free Turkish press, which could support republican ideals and get its power from the conscience of the nation. Violating its liberties was a violation of the republic. Freedom of the press was the soul of a republican regime. A republic without liberties was only a continuation of absolutism. A Republic was not compatible with any type of new or old aristocracy. But Faik Ahmet Bey believed that, under these conditions neither the freedom of the press and nor a free country could exist. And for him, Turkey had to choose its path between being a total civil democracy or a tyranny⁴⁸⁶. The situation of the Press hadn't changed since the Second Constitutional Monarchy period. And for Faik Ahmet Bey it was obvious that with the existing mentality, a new age of autocracy was coming. Every citizen and the newspapers had the right to express their thoughts freely. And contrary ideas had to compete independently, without any suppression. It was a part of the republican culture⁴⁸⁷. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the Government's policies created a regime of domination and it was increasing day by day.

Faik Ahmet Bey also criticised the government about the law of the press. He complained about the press law because the existing law was prepared during the second constitutional monarchy period. It was a law of the old constitution, which had been annulled by the people. The new regime and the revolution did not change the law and prepare a new one. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the press law was a product of absolutism and the republican regime had to change it; the law was inappropriate for republican ideals. It was a law of the Sultanate, and it was prepared to silence the free press. But the government was far from changing it; even the head of the government Fethi Bey supported the old law. But the law was against public liberties and the freedom of the press. And he believed that if the law was not be changed, the revolution and the republic would simply be ideas which couldn't actualize themselves in Turkey. The people would show their hostility against the arbitrary silencing of the free press, because censorship was an tool of the *ancien regime*. It was a policy, which was in conflict with a republic⁴⁸⁸.

⁴⁸⁶ Ahmed, Faik, "Bir Mahkumiyet", *Istikbal*, 15 Kanunısani 1341/1925: 1381.

⁴⁸⁷ Ahmed, Faik, "Toksöz'ün Tatili", *Istikbal*, 5 Kanunısani 1341/1925: 1373.

⁴⁸⁸ Ahmed, Faik "Hakikate Temas", *Istikbal*, 11 Kanunısani 1341/1925: 1378.

4.5.4. FAIK AHMET BEY'S LAST CRITICISMS:

Faik Ahmet Bey continued his criticism after the closing down of the Toksöz Newspaper. According to him, the regime was still trying to suppress the opposition after the closing of the newspaper and the main reason for that suppression was the duality within the People's Party between the followers of the Fethi Bey cabinet and the hardliners led by Recep Bey (Peker) inside the Party. Followers of the Prime Minister Fethi Bey's cabinet were closer to the Progressive Party and their ideology agreed with the Progressives. With the lack of a political programme, followers of Fethi Bey became much closer to them. But on the other hand, there were the hardliners led by Minister of the Interior Recep Bey (Peker) whose political agenda was completely different from the Fethi Bey Group. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that these two groups fell into disagreement with each other whenever a debate occurred. It was normal because the Party Programme didn't include any political, social, economical or cultural ideals. And even after the formation of the Progressive Party, divisions inside the Party continued⁴⁸⁹.

Faik Ahmet Bey believed that Recep Bey's group was following a strongly centralist agenda and they were even opposed to the free local administration of Istanbul Municipalities. The Recep Bey Group demanded the binding of those municipalities to the central administration and wanted an appointed administrator⁴⁹⁰. The Fethi Bey Group and the Progressive Party opposed them with democratic demands and supported the local administrations and free election of the people. Faik Ahmet Bey believed that the hardliners of the Party were against the people's self-administration and they wanted to control the country with a centralist program. But that was totally against republican principles and the democratical ideals and the sovereignty of the people followed by Fethi Bey Group and the Progressive Party. They were the ones who wanted to continue the Anatolian Revolution.

The struggle between the Fethi Bey and Recep Bey Groups ended with the resignation of Recep Bey. Recep Bey became the new General Secretary of the People's

⁴⁸⁹ Ahmed, Faik, "Merkeziyet Çenberi", *Istikbal*, 14 Kanunısani 1341/1925: 1380.

⁴⁹⁰ Çakan, Işıl, *Türk Parlamento Tarihi*, 229.

Party. For Faik Ahmet Bey his resignation might be a preparation of the Recep Bey's hardliner Group for new pressure on the Fethi Bey Cabinet⁴⁹¹. That Group blindly supported Ismet Pasha and they were ready for a struggle with Fethi Bey. Their ultimate aim was to form a new government consisting of the hardliners. Because of the support of the Progressive Party for Fethi Bey, and because Fethi Bey silently⁴⁹² opposed Toksöz newspaper's closing down, the hardliners became much more excited.

Faik Ahmet Bey also mentioned that the army had to stay away from politics. He believed that the deputies who were the commanders of the army had to choose one of their duties between their deputyship and commandership. According to him the army's duty was to protect the country, not to take part in politics⁴⁹³.

4.5.5. LAW ON THE MAINTENANCE OF ORDER PERIOD:

Faik Ahmet Bey wrote his last article on 15 January 1925. And it was about the closing down of the Toksöz Newspaper. Faik Ahmet Bey continued to organize and publish the newspaper, but he didn't write any more articles in his name. The incident of Toksöz newspaper could have been the main reason for this. The Newspaper continued to be published until 11 March 1925 with its 1426th issue. The relations between the government and the Newspaper became much more tense. And with the effect of highly critical articles written by Kapancızade Hamit Bey, relations became irreconcilable⁴⁹⁴. In the end, the Newspaper was closed down with the decision of the Independence Court and the Law on the Maintenance of Order period started. The period was used a chance by the regime to silence any independent associations, opposition movements, parties and newspapers. The passing of the new amendment to the High Treason Law (25 February 1925) and the Law on the Maintenance of Order (3 March 1925) made political opposition impracticable in Turkey⁴⁹⁵.

The two Laws changed the whole political scene in Turkey. First of all the Fethi Bey cabinet was dismissed on 2 March 1925 with a 94 general vote against 60. Fethi

⁴⁹¹ Ahmed, Faik, "Buhran İhtimalleri", *Istikbal*, 13 Kanunısani 1341/1925: 1379.

⁴⁹² Ahmed, Faik, "Receb Beyin İstifası", *Istikbal*, 6 Kanunısani 1340/1924: 1374.

⁴⁹³ Ahmed, Faik, "Musib Bir Teklif", *Istikbal*, 24 Kanunievvel 1341/1925: 1364.

⁴⁹⁴ Eken, Halit, Kapancızde Hamit Bey, 325.

⁴⁹⁵ Zürcher, Erik Jan, The Progressive Republican Party 113.

Bey was an important figure for the opposition movement along with Faik Ahmet Bey. In several of his articles, Faik Ahmet Bey defined Fethi Bey as a moderate and a liberal figure. And with his dismissal a new Ismet Pasha cabinet was formed on 4 March 1925. For Faik Ahmet Bey, the formation of an Ismet Pasha cabinet was always a symbol of the victory of the hardliners inside the People's Party. Faik Ahmet Bey's prediction was proved correct and Ismet Pasha declared the Law on the Maintenance of Order, formed two Independence Courts and declared martial law for the Eastern Provinces until 1927⁴⁹⁶.

The first enforcement of the Law occurred against the Press. Two days after the formation of the Ismet Pasha cabinet, Newspapers started to close down. The first wave was the Istanbul newspapers. *Tevhid-i Efkar*, *İstiklal*, *Son Telgraf*, *Aydınlık*, *Orak Çekiç ve Sebülülreşat* closed down on 7 March 1925 with the effect of the Law⁴⁹⁷. Those newspapers were mainly Islamist or Leftist. A day after the closing down of the newspapers, President Mustafa Kemal Pasha made a statement and mentioned that the enemies of the republic would be suppressed with force. Later on, the Progressive Party's Erzurum Delegate Rüşti Pasha gave a motion of inquiry to the Minister of the Interior, but no result could be taken, and afterwards Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın's *Tanin* Newspaper also closed down⁴⁹⁸. Many journalists were arrested and sent to the Independence courts and more newspapers closed down. Three days after the first wave of closings *Yoldaş (Bursa)*, *Presse de Soir*, *Resimli (Ay) Hafta*, *Millet (Istanbul)*, *Sadayı Hak (İzmir)*, *Doğru Öz (Mersin)*, *Kahkaha*, *Tok Söz*, *Sayha (Adana)* followed the other newspapers. And in the end, even though it openly supported the republican regime, *İstikbal* Newspaper also closed down on 11 March 1925. The decision was taken by the Court on 6 March 1925, based on a critical article by Kapancızade Hamit Bey. Faik Ahmet Barutçu didn't stand trial, but Hamit Bey was sent to the Independence court on 26 March 1926, arrested for thirty-seven days and set free on 2 March 1926⁴⁹⁹.

⁴⁹⁶ Tunçay, Mete, Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nde Teh Parti Yönetimi, 146.

⁴⁹⁷ Goloğlu, Mahmut, Devrimler ve Tepkileri, 136.

⁴⁹⁸ Tunçay, Mete, Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nde Tek Parti Yönetimi, 149.

⁴⁹⁹ Ekeni Halit, Kapancızade Hamit Bey, 329.

With the Law on the Maintenance of Order, the free press was silenced, the Progressive Party closed down and many journalists were tried. And with the effect of the Izmir plot against Mustafa Kemal Pasha, nearly all of the opposition was silenced. Faik Ahmet Bey was banned from journalism and politics until the death of Mustafa Kemal Pasha.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Faik Ahmet Barutçu was one of the earliest intellectuals to oppose the formation of the Single Party regime. Starting from the formation of the People's Party he showed his hostility to the coming regime. As a committed republican, democrat and liberal he sensed the defects of the new republic regime. According to him, the new regime was going to be a new sultanate and a new tyranny under the name of a republican regime. A republic which disrespected the sovereignty of the people and public opinion would be a sham republic. But Faik Ahmet Bey had desires; he fought for the Anatolian Revolution, he fought for the formation of the national struggle, and he was sure that he was entitled to determine the coming future of the country.

Until the murder of Ali Şükrü Bey, Faik Ahmet Bey strongly believed in the priority of the national goals over daily political conflicts. And he wrote articles to unify the movement. But murder of Ali Şükrü Bey was the beginning of a new age for Faik Ahmet Bey. According to him, Ali Şükrü Bey was a martyr for freedom. He used his right of freedom of expression and he fought for the public. According to Faik Ahmet Bey every member of the society had the right to express his or her thoughts. It was a natural right and Ali Şükrü Bey had been fighting for this goal. But the Government killed him and Faik Ahmet Bey was sure of that. After the murder he made a harsh speech at the funeral directly blaming Mustafa Kemal Pasha. Faik Ahmet Bey then openly joined the opposition forces.

After the murder he started to write articles with the political opinions of the Second Group. He defined his views on the sovereignty of the people, public rights, superiority of the Assembly and democracy. And he openly declared that the First Assembly of "non-republican times" had had a much more democratic structure. Faik Ahmet Bey was sure that the every political ideology and every political opinion had to be represented in the Parliament. According to him the Assembly was the organ which reflected public opinion and the people's will. There had to be free parties and a multi-party regime under a republican regime. And those parties had to compete in free elections.

But when Faik Ahmet Bey looked at the coming regime he saw a new type of tyranny under an over-authorised president. For him that was a massacre of republican ideals and a betrayal of the Anatolian Revolution. The people had fought against the Sultanate and they deserved a free republican democracy, not a new absolutism. Between the years 1924 and 1925 Faik Ahmet Bey redoubled his criticisms in his articles in *Istikbal* Newspaper. He fought against the coming tyranny and the 1923 elections; according to him an assembly without an opposition group was nothing. He also opposed the method of the declaration of the republican regime. According to him such a significant decision should be taken by asking the consent of the people. Faik Ahmet Bey also criticised the formation of the People's Party. He believed that with the lack of a political programme and political ideals, the Party was only a misshapen coalition of deputies. He also fought against the establishment of the Independence Courts against journalists and declared his belief in the freedom of press.

During 1924, Faik Ahmet Bey continued his critical agenda. He declared that the revolutionary reforms of the new regime were not able to liquidate the *ancien regime*. With the lack of a new press law and a new electoral law the absolutist structure of the past would continue. This became much clearer for him when he witnessed the 1924 Constitution. For him, with the over authorised rights of the President it was a Constitution which would create a new tyranny. Faik Ahmet Bey therefore welcomed the formation of the Progressive Party. According to him, the formation of a multi-party regime was essential for democracy. With its liberalist political program, for him, the new party would represent the ideals he missed; liberalism, democracy and the sovereignty of the people. He joined the Trabzon branch of the new party but the honeymoon quickly ended for him. After the closing of the *Toksöz* Newspaper, Faik Ahmet Bey stopped writing articles in *Istikbal* and a few years later his Newspaper was closed down by the Law of the Maintenance of Order. But until his last article, Faik Ahmet Bey continued his political struggle.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I- RESEARCH BOOKS:

- Ağaoğlu, Samet, Kuvayı Milliye Ruhu, İstanbul, Kaynak, 1999.
- Ahmad, Feroz, İttihatçılıktan Kemalizme, İstanbul: Kaynak, 1999.
- Akal, Emel, Milli Mücadelenin Başlangıcında Mustafa Kemal İttihat Terakki ve Bolşevizm, İstanbul: TÜSTAV, 2006.
- Akbal, İsmail, 1919-1923 Yılları Arasında Muhafız Kimliğiyle Trabzon, Ankara: Unpublished PhD. Thesis, 2004.
- Akbulut, Ömer, Trabzon Meşhurları Bibliyografyası : Edebiyatta, Sanatta, İlimde, Politikada ve Her Sahada Yetişmiş Trabzonluların Hayatı ve Eserleri, Ankara : Türkiye Ticaret Odaları, Sanayi Odaları ve Ticaret Borsaları Birliği Matbaası, 1970.
- Akgün, Seçil Karal, Halifeliğin Kaldırılması ve Laiklik 1924-1928, İstanbul: Temel, 2006.
- Albayrak, Hüseyin, Trabzon basın tarihi : Batum, Gümüşhane, Rize, Giresun, Ordu, Samsun basını 1869-1928, 1 Vols, Ankara : TDVY, 1994.
- Alpkaya, Faruk, Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin Kuruluşu (1923-1924), (İstanbul: İletişim, 1998.
- Avcıoğlu, Doğan, Milli Kurtuluş Tarihi-1838'den 1935'e, II, İstanbul: Tekin Yayınevi, 2001.
- Aybars, Ergün, İstiklal Mahkemeleri, İzmir: Zeus, 2006.
- Aydemir, Şevket Süreyya, Tek Adam Mustafa Kemal 1922-1938, İstanbul: Remzi, 2001.
- Bal, Mehmet Akif, Hatıralarda Trabzon'un Yakın Tarihi, Trabzon: abp Yayınları, 2004.
- Coşar, Ömer Sami, Osman Ağa: "Topal Osman": Mustafa Kemal'in Muhafızı, Harman, 1971.
- Çakan, Işıl, Türk Parlamento Tarihinde II. Meclis, İstanbul: Cumhuriyet Kitap Kulübü, 1999.

- Çapa, Mesut, Faik Ahmet Barutçu Hayatı ve Kişiliği, Trabzon : T .C. Trabzon Valiliği İl Kültür Müdürlüğü, 1998.
- , Mesut, Milli Mücadele Döneminde Trabzon Müdafaa-i Hukuk Cemiyeti, Trabzon : Trabzon Belediyesi, 1998.
- , Mesut, Pontus Meselesi, Trabzon : Serander Yayınları, 2001.
- Çevik,Zeki, Milli Mücadele’de Müdafaa-i Hukuk’tan Halk Fırkası’na Geçiş, Ankara: AKDTYK, 2002.
- Demircioğlu, Asuman, Faik Ahmet Barutçu (Bey) ve Istikbal Gazetesi (1918 Yılı Sonu ve 1922 Yılı)(Unpublished PhD. Thesis), Ankara, 2001.
- Demirel, Ahmet, Birinci Meclis’te Muhalefet-İkinci Grup, İstanbul: İletişim, 1995.
- Demirel, Meral, Tam Bir Muhalif-Abdülkadir Kemali Bey, İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2006.
- Dursunoğlu, Cevat, Milli Mücadelede Erzurum, İstanbul : Kaynak Yayınları, 2000.
- Eken, Halit, Bir Milli Mücadele Valisinin Anıları, Kapancızade Mehmet Bey, İstanbul: Yeditepe Yayınevi, 2008.
- Goloğlu, Mahmut, Milli Mücadele tarihi: Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Tarihi, 1 Vols, Ankara: Goloğlu Yayınları, 1972.
- , Mahmut, Milli Mücadelede Trabzon ve Mustafa Kemal Pasha, Trabzon: KTÜ Basımevi, 1981.
- , Mahmut, Devrimler ve Tepkileri 1924-1930, İstanbul: T.İşbankası Kültür Yayınları, 2008.
- , Mahmut, Erzurum Kongresi Milli Mücadele Tarihi 1, İstanbul: T.İşbankası Kültür Yayınları, 2008.
- Göldaş, İsmail, Takrir-i Sükûn Görüşmeleri : 1923 Seçimleri, Atama Meclis, İstanbul : Belge Yayınları, 1997.
- Gözübüyük, Şeref, Sezgin, Zekai, 1924 Anayasası Hakkındaki Meclis Görüşmeleri, Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi, 1957.
- Güneş, İhsan, Birinci TBMM’nin Düşünsel Yapısı, (1920-1923), İstanbul: T.İşbankası Kültür Yayınları, 1997.
- Kinross, Patrick, Atatürk The Rebirth of a Nation, London: Phoneix, 2001.
- Kocaoğlu, Bünyamin, Milli Mücadelede İttihatçılık, İstanbul: Temel Yayınları, 2006.

Kocatürk, Utkan, Atatürk ve Türkiye Cumhuriyeti tarihi kronolojisi, 1918-1938, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1988.

Macfie, A.L., The End of the Ottoman Empire, 1908-1923, New York : Longman, 1998.

-----, A.L. Atatürk, London ; New York : Longman, 1994.

Mango, Andrew, Atatürk, London : John Murray, 1999.

Mısıroğlu, Kadir, Ali Şükrü Bey : şehid-i muzzez, İstanbul : Sebil Yayınevi, 1995.

Odabaşoğlu, Cumhur, Belgelerle Milli Mücadele yılları 1919-1923, Trabzon : C. Odabaşoğlu, 1990.

Önal, Sami, Hüsrev Gerede'nin anıları : Kurtuluş Savaşı, Atatürk ve devrimler (19 Mayıs 1919-10 Kasım 1938), Beyoğlu, İstanbul, Türkiye : Literatür Yayınları, 2002.

Özel, Sabahattin, Milli Mücadele'de Trabzon, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1991.

Parla, Taha, Türkiye'de Anayasalar, İstanbul: İletişim, 2002.

Sakallı, Bayram, Milli Mücadelenin Sosyal Tarihi, İstanbul: İz Yayıncılık, 1997.

Selek, Sabahattin, Anadolu İhtilali, I,II, İstanbul, Kastaş: 2004.

Tanör, Bülent, Osmanlı-Türk Anayasal Gelişmeleri, İstanbul: YKY, 2004.

Tunçay, Mete, Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nde Tek Parti Yönetimi'nin kurulması 1923-1931, İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2005.

Velidedeoğlu, Hıfzı Veldet, İlk Meclis Milli Mücadele'de Anadolu TBMM'nin 70. Yılı 1920-1990, (İstanbul: Çağdaş, 1990).

Yerasimos, Stefanos, Az gelişmişlik Sürecinde Türkiye, 3 Vols, İstanbul: Belge, 2005.

Yükseliman, Nihan, Parti Devlet Bütünleşmesi, İstanbul: Gelenek, 2002.

Yüksel, Murat, Ali Şükrü Bey ve Topal Osman Ağa, Trabzon: Yunus Dergisi Yayınları, 1997.

Zürcher, Erik Jan, The Unionist factor : the role of the Committee of Union and Progress in the Turkish National Movement 1905-1926, Leiden : Brill, 1984.

-----, Erik Jan, Political Opposition in the Early Turkish Republic- The Progressive Republican Party 1924-1925, Leiden: Brill 1991.

II- MEMOIRS:

Arıkođlu, Damar, Hatıralarım, İstanbul: Tan Gazetesi ve Matbaası.

Atay, Falih Rıfki, Çankaya, İstanbul: Pozitif Yayınları, 2004.

Atatürk, Mustafa Kemal, Nutuk, Ankara: Bizbize, 2007.

Barutçu, Faik Ahmet, Siyasi Hatıralar – Milli Mücadeleden Demokrasiye, 2 Vols, İstanbul: 21.Yüzyıl Yayınları, 2001.

Cebesoy, Ali Fuat, Siyasi Hatıralar, İstanbul: Temel, 2007.

Demirel, Yücel, Dersim Mebusu Lütfi Fikri Bey'in günlüğü : "Daima Muhalefet", İstanbul : ARMA Yayınları, 1991.

Kansu, Mazhar Müfit, Erzurum'dan Ölümüne Kadar Atatürk'le Beraber, 2 Vols, Ankara: TTK, 1988.

Karabekir, Kazım, İstiklal Harbimiz, 2 Vols, İstanbul: Emre, 199?.

Karaman, Sami Sabit, İstiklal mücadelesi ve Enver Pasha : Trabzon ve Kars hatıraları 1921-1922, İzmir, Selüloz Yayınevi, 19??.

Lermiođlu, Ömer Faruk, Kadirbeyođlu Zeki Bey'in Hatıraları, İstanbul: Sebil Yayınları, 2007.

Orbay, Rauf, Siyasi Hatıralar, İstanbul: Ögün, 2003.

Topuz, Hıfzı, Türk Basın Tarihi, İstanbul: Remzi, 2003.

Yalman, Ahmed Emin, Yakın Tarihte Gördüklerim ve Geçirdiklerim, 2 Vols, İstanbul: Pera Turizm ve Ticaret, 1997.

III- ACADEMIC ARTICLES:

Akbal, İsmail, "Milli Mücadele Kadrolarının Bolşevizme Yaklaşımı ve Trabzon'da Bolşevizm Karşıtı İki Sima: Hafız Mehmet Bey ve Vali Hamit Bey", Karadeniz Tarihi Sempozyumu, Trabzon: KTÜ Yay, 25-26 Mayıs 2005.

Albayrak, Hüseyin, "Millî Mücadelede Trabzon Basını ve İstikbâl Gazetesi", Trabzon Tarihi İlmî Toplantısı : 6-8 Kasım 1998, bildiriler, (Trabzon Türk Ocađı, Trabzon Belediyesi, Trabzon Valiliđi,2000) 560-576.

Çapa, Mesut, "Milli Mücadele Döneminde İstikbal Gazetesi", Atatürk Yolu 9., (Ankara Üniversitesi 1992) 133-169.

Demirciođlu, Asuman, “Faik Ahmet Bey ve Cumhuriyet”, Atatürk Dergisi 1 (Ankara Üniversitesi, 2000) 71-83.

Demirel, Ahmet, “Milli Mücadele Döneminde Birinci Meclis’teki Liberal Fikirler ve Tartışmalar”, Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce-Liberalizm, 7 Vols, (İstanbul: İletişim, 2005) 164-184.

Okur, Mehmet, “Milli Mücadele Döneminde Fener Rum Patrikhanesi’nin ve Metropolitlerin Pontus Rum Devleti Kurulmasına Yönelik Girişimleri”, Atatürk Yolu 29 (2002), 9.

Smith, E. “Debates on Turkish Constitution of 1924”, Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi, 3 (Eylül 1958): 82-131.

IV- NEWSPAPERS:

Istikbal