

THE RELATIONS OF İSTANBUL AND ANKARA WITHIN THE PRESS OF
TURKISH NATIONAL STRUGGLE (1918-1922)

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

ALİ DEMİREL

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

JULY 2018

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Tülin Gençöz
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Prof. Dr. Ömer Turan
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Prof. Dr. Ömer Turan
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Mustafa Yılmaz (Hacettepe Uni., AİT)

Prof. Dr. Ömer Turan (METU, HIST)

Assist. Prof. Dr. Akile Zorlu Durukan (METU, HIST)

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name : Ali Demirel

Signature :

ABSTRACT

THE RELATIONS OF İSTANBUL AND ANKARA WITHIN THE PRESS OF TURKISH NATIONAL STRUGGLE (1918-1922)

Demirel, Ali

M.A., Department of History

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Ömer Turan

July 2018, 305 Pages

The basic goal of this thesis is to analyze the relations of the Turkish Nationalists with the İstanbul Governments, the Allied powers and also Soviet Russia during the Turkish National Struggle with a special focus on the religious-judicial and military-political legitimacy of the National movement as reflected in the newspapers published in İstanbul and Anatolia.

Except for three anti-nationalist newspapers, *Türkçe İstanbul*, *Alemdar* and *Peyam-ı Sabah*, the most influential nationalist newspapers, *İkdam*, *İfham*, *Tasvir-i Efkar*, *Vakit*, *İleri*, *Yeni Gün*, *Akşam*, *Hadisat*, *Öğüt*, *Albayrak*, *Açıksöz*, *İrade-i Milliye*, *İzmir'e Doğru* and *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, published in İstanbul and Anatolia supported the National movement in spite of heavy censorship of the İstanbul Government and the Allied powers. These newspapers defended that the Nationalists achieved the religious and legal legitimacy by establishing the society for the defense of rights, organizing national congresses, publishing a fatwa against İstanbul, opening the Grand National Assembly, and enacting laws in Ankara.

In addition, according to the publications of the nationalist press in İstanbul and Anatolia, the National Government in Ankara proved its diplomatic-political legitimacy in the international arena thanks to the great military victories, such as Battles of İnönü, Sakarya and the Great Offensive. The political agreements of the Ankara Government, like the Ankara Treaty, signed with France, the Moscow Treaty of Friendship signed with Soviet Russia, and finally, the Mudanya Armistice Treaty signed with representatives of the Allied powers prepared the ground the Ankara Government for being sole representative of the Turkish people in the international arena.

Keywords: The National Struggle, the Relations of İstanbul-Ankara, the Press, Legitimacy

ÖZ

TÜRK MİLLİ MÜCADELE BASININDA İSTANBUL VE ANKARA ARASI İLİŞKİLER (1918-1922)

Demirel, Ali

Yüksek Lisans, Tarih Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Ömer Turan

Temmuz 2018, 305 Sayfa

Bu tezin temel amacı Millî Mücadele döneminde Türk Milliyetçilerinin hem İstanbul Hükümetleri hem de İtilaf Devletleri ve Sovyet Rusya ile kurduğu ve dönemin İstanbul ve Anadolu'da yayınlanan gazetelerine yansıyan ilişkilerini analiz etmektir. Bu bağlamda, Milli Mücadelenin dini-hukuki ve diplomatik-askeri meşruiyeti özel olarak ele alınmıştır.

Türkçe İstanbul, Alemdar ve Peyam-ı Sabah, gibi üç milliyetçi karşıtı gazete istisna, *İkdam, İfham, Tasvir-i Efkar, Vakit, İleri, Yeni Gün, Akşam, Hadisat, Öğüt, Albayrak, Açıksöz, İrade-i Milliye, İzmir'e Doğru* ve *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* gibi hem İstanbul hem de Anadolu'da yayınlanan en etkili milliyetçi gazeteler, İstanbul hükümetlerinin ve İtilaf güçlerinin yoğun sansürüne rağmen Milli hareketi desteklemişlerdir. Bu gazeteler Milliyetçilerin, müdafaa-i hukuk cemiyetleri kurarak, milli kongreler düzenleyerek, İstanbul Hükümeti'ne karşı fetva yayımlayarak, Ankara'da Büyük Millet Meclisi'ni açıp kanunlar koyarak dini ve hukuki meşruiyetlerini sağladıklarını savunmuşlardır.

Ayrıca, İstanbul ve Anadolu'daki milliyetçi basın yayınlarına göre, Ankara'daki Milli Hükümet, İnönü, Sakarya ve Büyük Taarruz gibi büyük askeri zaferleri sayesinde uluslararası alanda diplomatik-siyasi meşruiyetini ispat etmiştir. Ankara Hükümeti'nin Fransa ile imzaladığı Ankara İtilafnamesi, Sovyet Rusya ile imzaladığı Moskova Dostluk Antlaşması ve İtilaf güçlerinin temsilcileri ile imzaladığı Mudanya Mütarekesi gibi siyasi antlaşmalar, Ankara Hükümeti'nin uluslararası camiada Türk milletinin tek temsilcisi konumuna gelmesinin zeminini hazırlamıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Milli Mücadele, İstanbul-Ankara İlişkileri, Basın, Meşruiyet

To My Family

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First of all, I am very grateful to my supervisor Ömer Turan for his continuous support, invaluable guidance and patience during my study. He has been a very good and helpful instructor throughout the process. Also, I would like to thank to Mustafa Yılmaz and Akile Zorlu Durukan for their participation to my thesis committee and their engaged reading, critics and comments which undoubtedly improved this thesis.

I owe special thanks to the staff of the section of periodicals of the Turkish National Library in Ankara and the staff of the Hakkı Tarık Us Library in İstanbul.

I would also like to express special thanks to Atatürk Research Center (Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi, ATAM) for its valuable financial support during the first two years of my graduate study.

Also, I thank for the priceless encouragement, help and care of the faculty members of my Department and my friends.

Last but not least, I am very grateful to my parents and my whole family for their love and support through my entire life, decisions and ambitions.

PREFACE

In this research, it was tried to examine in detail the religious-legal and diplomatic-military legitimacy of the Turkish National Struggle according to the İstanbul and Anatolian press, on the basis of the relations of the Nationalists with both the İstanbul Governments and the Allied Powers and the Soviet Russia.

When looked at the work done up to this point, the press in the period of National Struggle was not reviewed collectively. According to the literature survey, a newspaper published during this period was selected and presented in general terms, and events of the period were analyzed only from the point of view of that journal. The main ones of these works are as follows: *I.İnönü Zaferi'nden İzmir'in Kurtuluşuna Kadar Açıksöz Gazetesi'nde Hârici Haberler, İkdâm Gazetesi 1918 Yılı (İnceleme ve Seçilmiş Metinler), Tasvir-i Efkar Gazetesi Üzerine Bir İnceleme (1-451. Sayılar), Peyam-Sabah Gazetesinde Milli Mücadele, I.İnönü Zaferi'nden İzmir'in Kurtuluşuna Kadar Açıksöz Gazetesinde Batı Cephesi Haberleri, Hâkimiyet-i Milliye Gazetesine Göre Milli Mücadele Döneminde Türk-İngiliz İlişkileri*. These studies in general have not been able to go beyond the understanding of the journalism and also they are limited to information obtained from a one-sided viewpoint. For this reason, it can be said that it is necessary to carry out a detailed study covering the press of the period of Turkish National Struggle as a whole.

In this study, among the resources to be used in the studies on the press of the Turkish War of Independence, the most popular opposing and nationalist newspapers were scanned and the news and comments related to the study were translated from Ottoman Turkish to English. In addition, articles from different newspapers on the same topic were compared and examined with an integrated and critical approach. Also, the newspapers in İstanbul made relatively limited publications due to censorship. In this case, the topics were analyzed with the news published in the Anatolian press.

Another feature that makes this study important is that it is possible to learn thoughts of Western public opinion about the Turkish War of Independence through external news published in İstanbul and Anatolian press. The news from the British, French, Italian, Greek and Armenian press are extremely important in terms of reflecting the attitude of the world public on the legitimacy of the National Struggle.

The newspapers provided information and made evaluations according to their attitudes towards the National Struggle; for or against it. The newspapers were also used as propaganda tools. For this reason, in order to reflect the truth in the subjects examined, the memories of the people who played important roles during the National Struggle period and other scientific publications were also benefited in the study. Objective information about the topics has been primarily investigated from scientific studies and then all topics have been interpreted according to the publications in the press.

Ali DEMİREL

Ankara, 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ.....	vi
DEDICATION.....	viii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	ix
PREFACE.....	x
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	xii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	xvi
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. İSTANBUL AND ANATOLIAN PRESS IN THE NATIONAL STRUGGLE.....	7
2.1 İstanbul Press in the Period of the National Struggle.....	7
2.1.1 The Nationalist Newspapers.....	12
2.1.1.1 İkdam [Working Firmly].....	12
2.1.1.2 İfham [Recital].....	13
2.1.1.3 Tasvir-i Efkar [Description of Thoughts].....	14
2.1.1.4 Vakit [Time].....	16
2.1.1.5 İleri [Forward].....	17
2.1.1.6 Yeni Gün [New Day].....	18
2.1.1.7 Akşam [Evening].....	20
2.1.1.8 Hadisat [Events]	21
2.1.2 The Anti-Nationalist Newspapers.....	22
2.1.2.1 Türkçe İstanbul [Turkish İstanbul].....	22
2.1.2.2 Alemdar [Flag-Bearer].....	23
2.1.2.3 Peyam-ı Sabah [Morning News].....	26
2.2 Anatolian Press in the Period of the National Struggle.....	28
2.2.1 The Nationalist Newspapers.....	31

2.2.1.1	Öğüt [Advice].....	31
2.2.1.2	Albayrak [Red Flag].....	32
2.2.1.3	Açıksöz [Outspoken].....	33
2.2.1.4	İrade-i Milliye [National Will].....	35
2.2.1.5	İzmir'e Doğru [Towards İzmir].....	37
2.2.1.6	Hakimiyet-i Milliye [National Sovereignty].....	38
2.3	News Sources of Newspapers in the National Struggle.....	40
2.3.1	Formation of Anatolian Agency.....	40
2.3.2	Establishment of General Directorate of Press and Intelligence.....	42
2.4	The Significance of the Press for Mustafa Kemal Pasha.....	43
3.	LEGAL AND RELIGIOUS ASPECTS OF LEGITIMACY OF TURKISH NATIONAL STRUGGLE.....	47
3.1	Emergence of the National Struggle and Attitude of İstanbul Governments Towards Developments in Anatolia.....	47
3.1.1	İstanbul Governments During the Period of the Armistice and the National Struggle.....	47
3.1.2	The Mondros Armistice and the First Occupations.....	59
3.1.3	Occupation of İzmir and its Effects on the National Movement.....	65
3.1.4	Movement of Mustafa Kemal Pasha to Anatolia and the First Activities.....	79
3.1.4.1	The Amasya Circular and its Political and Legal Importance.....	88
3.1.4.2	The Erzurum Congress and the Resignation of Mustafa Kemal Pasha.....	94
3.1.4.3	The Sivas Congress and the Fall of Damat Ferid Cabinet.....	106
3.1.5	Need of İstanbul Getting in Contact with Anatolia.....	118
3.1.5.1	Amasya Protocol and the Official Recognition.....	118
3.2	The Relations of Ankara-İstanbul Until the Opening of Grand National Assembly.....	127

3.2.1	Opening of the Ottoman Parliament and the National Pact....	127
3.2.2	Official Occupation of İstanbul and its Effects on the Legitimacy of National Struggle.....	136
3.2.3	Fatwas of Ankara and İstanbul Concerning the Legitimacy of National Struggle.....	150
3.3	Relations of Ankara-İstanbul After Opening of the Grand National Assembly.....	161
3.3.1	Legal and Political Importance of the Grand National Assembly.....	161
3.3.2	Conflicts between Ankara and İstanbul and Revolts Against the Ankara Government.....	169
3.3.3	Intimacy of İstanbul and Ankara Governments: Bilecik Meeting.....	178
4.	DIPLOMATIC AND MILITARY ASPECTS OF LEGITIMACY OF TURKISH NATIONAL STRUGGLE.....	188
4.1	The Diplomatic Relations of the Ankara Government With the Allied Powers and Soviet Russia.....	188
4.1.1	The Initial Contacts of the Representative Committee With The Allied Powers.....	188
4.1.1.1	The Turkish Nationalists and the USA.....	188
4.1.1.2	The Turkish Nationalists and Britain.....	189
4.1.1.3	The Turkish Nationalists and France.....	191
4.1.1.4	The Turkish Nationalists and Italy.....	195
4.1.2	San Remo Conference and the Sevres Project of the Allies....	197
4.1.3	Signing of the Sevres Treaty and Reaction of the Ankara Government.....	205
4.1.4	Diplomatic Relations With Soviet Russia and the Monetary and Military Aids.....	214
4.2	Military Successes of the Ankara Government and Consolidation of The Authority.....	220
4.2.1	The National Forces in the Press.....	220
4.2.2	The Independent Armenia Project in the Eastern Anatolia and	

The Reaction of the Ankara Government.....	225
4.2.2.1 Capture of Kars by the National Forces.....	225
4.2.2.2 The News From the Eastern Front.....	228
4.2.3 Military Victories Againsts the Greeks in the Western Front....	232
4.2.3.1 The First Battle of İnönü and its Results.....	232
4.2.3.2 The Second Battle of İnönü and its Results.....	238
4.2.3.3 The Battle of Sakarya and its Results.....	242
4.3 Political Agreements of the Ankara Government.....	249
4.3.1 The Gümrü Treaty with Armenia and its Importance.....	249
4.3.2 The Moscow Treaty of Friendship.....	250
4.3.3 The Treaty of Ankara with France.....	256
4.3.4 Legal Recognition: Mudanya Conference and Armistice.....	263
5. CONCLUSIONS.....	269
REFERENCES.....	275
APPENDICES	
A. TURKISH SUMMARY / TÜRKÇE ÖZET.....	291
B. TEZ FOTOKOPİ İZİN FORMU.....	305

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AA	Anatolian Agency
AAMD	Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Dergisi
AAMY	Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Yayınları
TİTE AYD	Türk İnkılap Tarihi Enstitüsü Atatürk Yolu Dergisi
COMP.	Compiled
CUP	Committee of Union and Progress
GDPI	General Directorate of Press and Intelligence
GNA	Grand National Assembly
Gnkur. B. B.	Genelkurmay Başkanlığı Basımevi
N./No.	Number
Prep.	Prepared
SDR	Society for the Defence of the Rights
TİBKY	Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları
TTK	Türk Tarih Kurumu
Trans.	Translated
TV	Takvimi Vakayi
U.D.D.	Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation
U.M.T.	Unpublished Master's Thesis
Vol.	Volume

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Nineteenth century is the time of European ascent to a position of power which manifested itself ultimately in imperialist policies. Britain and France were dominant powers during the course of nineteenth century thanks to their economic, military and technological strength and had established transcontinental colonial empires. However, the new developments began to emerge towards the end of nineteenth century in Europe. In the 1870s, Germany and Italy realized their political unifications and they rose as new powers. Rising new national states de-stabilized the status quo assured with the Vienna Congress in 1815 and the balance of power in Europe was destroyed. Germany and Italy immediately tried to establish their own colonial systems as rivals to Britain and France. The new states made attempts to form a new balance of power and these attempts engendered new sets of blocks and conflicts. As a result, the tension among European states increased considerably, mutual armament accelerated and countries came to the brink of war.

When the First World War broke out, the Allied powers did not consider incorporating the Ottoman Empire into their own blocks. They rather acted on partitioning after suffering great losses at the end of the Balkan Wars. The Ottoman statesmen decided to enter the war with Germany by making a secret alliance on August 2, 1914. The Ottoman army had to fight on many fronts both in Anatolia and Europe. At the beginning, Ottomans achieved great military successes in Gallipoli and Iraq, Kut-ul Amare. However, these proved insufficient to reach final victory and the Ottoman army began to dissolve. It had to withdraw in 1918, and the Great War resulted in the defeat of the Ottoman Empire.

After the defeat, the Mondros Armistice, which had very severe conditions, was signed between the Allied powers and the Ottoman Empire on October 30, 1918.¹

¹ Türk İstiklal Harbi, Vol. I, (Mondros Mütarekesi ve Tatbikatı), (Ankara: Gnkur.B.B., 1962), pp. 45-46.

Indeed, the Armistice consisting of twenty five provisions finished the armed conflict between the Ottoman army and the Allies. In accordance with armistice stipulations, demobilization of the army, submission of military supplies and transportation and communication tools ensued. The Mondros Armistice permitted the Allies to occupy the Ottoman territories without confronting any resistance, depending on the ambiguous clause VII, which allowed the Allies to occupy any area if they thought there was a security threat.² It can be also regarded as an invasion plan aiming at the division of Anatolia and wiping out the presence of the Turkish people. After the Armistice, the Allied powers started to occupy Anatolia as they had planned before. The occupation deeply wounded the Turkish people's conscience and caused the great reaction of Turkish people.

After the Armistice, the İstanbul press fell into disbelief and pessimism like the Ottoman statesmen. The newspapers offered two different proposals for the emancipation of the country. In order to save the country from partition, either the American mandate or British protectorate was to be adopted. The newspapers, such as *İkdam*, *İfham* and *Tasvir-i Efkar*, which supported the National Struggle later, defended the American mandate while newspapers, such as *Turkish İstanbul*, *Alemdar* and *Peyam-Sabah*, which opposed the national resistance and supported the Freedom and Accord Party (Hürriyet and İtilaf Partisi), defended the British protection. After the signing of the Armistice, there has been enormous conflict between the newspapers advocating American or British patronage.

This attitude of the İstanbul press reflects the typical political and social mentality of Ottoman statesmen, elites and society in the final period of Ottoman history. The only solution engraved in society's subconscious for salvation was to get patronage of a powerful foreign state. In other words, accepting the great powers' mandate was only possible way to prevent the dissolution of the state and the country. According to the journals, it seemed almost impossible to start a struggle for independence.

Immediately after the Mondros Armistice, when the danger of division and occupation emerged, the leaders of the endangered regions began to form

² Türk İstiklal Harbi, Vol. I, pp. 45-46.

associations called *Defense for Rights* (Müdafaa-i Hukuk). These organizations grew more, were centralized at the Sivas Congress held September 4-11, 1919 and eventually took deep roots in the whole country.³ It became the leading entity in the process of the resistance movement.

It is generally considered that The Turkish War of Independence started after the occupation of İzmir by the Greeks on May 19, 1919. However, it would be a better assessment to accept the starting date of the National movement as the Mondros Armistice. Even before May 19, 1919, there were armed conflicts and local resistances in some areas. Besides, the concept of resistance war cannot be reduced to armed conflict. The War of Independence was carried out by applying various methods, such as formations of organization, publications, propaganda, protest meetings, negotiations, and correspondences. Hence, it is natural to accept October 30, 1918, as a starting point.

The Turkish War of Independence corresponded to a period, in which empires were destroyed and independent nation states were established. This norm inevitably affected the leaders of the In addition, the French Revolution had considerable influence on Turkish intellectuals, such as journalists, writers, bureaucrats and military school graduates. Most of these intellectuals came through the struggle against the oppressive rule of the reign of Abdulhamid II (1876-1909). Turkish intellectuals were aware of what had been happened until that time in the world and had much knowledge and experience for a national struggle.

Besides, the 1917 Bolshevik Revolution that broke out in Russia threatened Europe and this threat facilitated the practices of the Turkish Nationalists. Mustafa Kemal and his followers, who formed the leading cadres of the National Struggle, frequently stated that they served same purpose with this revolution and they fought against the common enemy.

After the National Struggle started becoming effective in Anatolia, the newspapers published in İstanbul and Anatolia took a stand towards the movement in accordance with their political orientations and publication principles. Many influential

³ Zeki Sarıhan, *Kurtuluş Savaşı'nda İkili İktidar*, (İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, 2000), p. 16.

newspapers like *İkdam*, *Tasvir-i Efkar*, *İfham*, *Vakit*, *İleri*, *Yeni Gün*, *Akşam*, *Hadisat*, had positively approached and relatively supported the movement in spite of the censorship and oppression of the İstanbul Governments and the Allied powers. The newspapers, such as *Türkçe İstanbul*, *Alemdar* and *Peyam-i Sabah* were completely opposed to the national movement. They described the Nationalists as gangs and bandits. Both sides had justifiable reasons for themselves. The first group of newspapers thought that Ottoman rule was restrained and could not act freely. Obviously, the press believed that the diplomatic measures and practices of Ottoman bureaucrats would no longer be able to save the state and that a reconciliatory policy with the Allies was useless. The second group of journals had taken a submissive attitude even after the National movement. They argued that the protectionism was the best way to keep the state as whole. The media in this group believed that a struggle for independence would never succeed because the Ottoman Empire was defeated in WWI despite receiving great support from Germany which provided approximately two million soldiers. Now the country was besieged from all sides and the lands were occupied. Anatolia alone could not achieve victory under these circumstances.

During this period, the Anatolian press supported the National Struggle to the extent of its own possibilities. As a matter of fact, newspapers published in Anatolia were not as effective as the İstanbul press. The literacy rate in Anatolia was very low and the influence of newspapers was questionable. Still, the leading elite of the Turkish National Struggle, representing the progressive part of the military and civil bureaucracy, used the Anatolian press as a means of propaganda. They tried to unite the Turkish people around the National resistance, through official announcements, statements, declarations and laws they published. The people of Anatolia participated in this movement for the integrity and independence of the country. However, their underlying motivation was to save the Caliph-Sultan, whom they had considered invincible and sacred for centuries. A new administrative system based on a new nation-state or national will had no meaning for the people of Anatolia. The press was just a tool to direct these people to one common purpose. Turkish people regarded the liberation of the Caliph-Sultan, who they regarded as the sole religious and political authority, as a religious necessity and took the side of the National

movement based on the fatwa published by the Turkish Nationalists in the newspapers in Anatolia.

Turkish National Struggle was a total resurgence movement started by the Turkish people against the invasions and attacks of the enemies such as the Allied powers, Greeks, and Armenians in order to achieve the salvation of Anatolian lands, remaining in the hand of the Ottoman Empire after WWI. This struggle aimed to bring together the whole nation with the help of the National Pact (Misak-ı Milli), which envisaged that portions of Ottoman Empire where the Turks were in a majority should remain under Turkish rule.⁴ In order to put the National Pact into force, the Nationalists applied many offensive and defensive military operations in the Eastern and Western Parts of Anatolia. Moreover, the military victories of Nationalists, such as the capture of Kars, Battles of İnönü, Sakarya, and the Great Offensive provided the Nationalists with the diplomatic achievements like Gümrü Treaty, the Moscow Treaty of Friendship, Ankara Treaty and Mudanya Armistice in the international arena. The nationalist newspapers were pleased with the military and political achievements. The anti-nationalist newspapers were silenced after these successes. In addition, they asserted that they had already wished the salvation of the country, but they had suggested different solutions to the common problems of Turkish people.

In this study, I will set out to analyze the relations of the Nationalists in Ankara with the İstanbul Governments and the Allied powers and also Soviet Russia as reflected in the newspapers published in İstanbul and Anatolia during the Turkish National Struggle. This study will try to approach the issue with a special focus on the religious-judicial and military-political legitimacy of the national resistance movement. In this sense, the thesis will try figure out how the Nationalists could achieve to establish legitimate ground of their national cause in terms of religious-judicial and military-political aspects. Besides, the study will dwell on the influence and role of the nationalist and anti-nationalist newspapers in motivating people towards the resistance and in creating public opinion during the this period.

⁴ Sarıhan, *Kurtuluş Savaşı'nda İki...* p. 16.

“The Relations of İstanbul and Ankara within the Press of Turkish National Struggle (1918-1922)” is composed of three main sections, excluding the introduction and conclusion parts.

In the first section, the main sources of the study; that is, the İstanbul and Anatolian press of the period were introduced. The newspapers of İstanbul and Anatolia were classified according to where they were published and attitude they took towards the National Struggle. Moreover, the owners, editorial writers and publication dates of the newspapers were explained in detail. Finally, the establishment and function of Anatolian Agency and the General Directorate of Press and Intelligence as the main news sources of the press in this period were examined.

The second section of the study dwelled on the relations of the Nationalists with the İstanbul Governments from starting of the national movement to emerging and strengthening the new government in Ankara. In this part, the important events and developments of the national movement such as the Amasya Circular and Protocol, the Erzurum and Sivas Congresses, opening of the Grand National Assembly and fatwas of İstanbul and Ankara were investigated in terms of the legal and religious legitimacy of the National Struggle and the reaction of the İstanbul Governments against those developments was evaluated. That is, it was analyzed that how the Nationalists could build and fortify their legal and religious legitimacy against the negative discourses of the İstanbul Governments.

In the third and last section, diplomatic and military stage of the National Struggle was discussed. In this part, the study elaborated the diplomatic relations of the Nationalists with Allied Powers and Soviet Russia and also the military campaigns against the Greeks and Armenians. It was shown that the military victories allowed the Nationalists to destroy the Sevres Project of the Allied Powers and these achievements brought the diplomatic successes to them. With the advantage of diplomatic successes such as the Gümrü Treaty, the Moscow Treaty of Friendship, Ankara Treaty and Mudanya Armistice, following the military victories of Armenian Campaign in the Eastern Front, Battles of İnönü, Sakarya and the Great Offensive, enabled the Nationalists to be approved by the Allied Powers and Soviet Russia as the sole legitimate representative of Turkish people.

CHAPTER 2

İSTANBUL AND ANATOLIAN PRESS IN THE NATIONAL STRUGGLE

2.1. İstanbul Press in the Period of the National Struggle

A period of political turmoil started to prevail all over the Ottoman Empire after the signing of the Mondros Armistice between the Allies and the Ottoman Empire on October 30, 1918. As the administrative center of the Ottoman Empire, İstanbul was one of the most important cities to encounter the great political disturbance and to the seemingly inevitable dismemberment of the country began to take strong root in the city. Especially, after the Union and Progress Party withdrew from the government and the leaders of the CUP, Enver, Talat and Cemal Pasha fled to Europe on November 3, 1918, a political authority gap emerged in İstanbul. Therefore, the Freedom and Accord Party (Hürriyet and İtilaf Partisi) tried to take place of the CUP and the members of Freedom and Accord Party started to seize Sultan Vahdettin (1918-1922), who followed after Sultan Mehmet Reşad (1909-1918). Rıza Tevfik, a member of the Freedom and Accord Party, had already been Minister of Education in the first Cabinet of Ahmet Tevfik Pasha (November 11, 1918 – January 12, 1919).⁵

The evil conditions of the capital had an influence on the press as well. The CUP had kept the press under strict censorship and had not allowed any criticism. When the censorship on the press was lifted with the advent of the Armistice, the anti-unionist press, like *Türkçe İstanbul*, *Alemdar*, *Peyam*, and *Sabah* found fertile ground to vent suppressed animosity. The voices of the unionist press were naturally silenced and the anti-unionist press, which generally supported the policy of the Freedom and Accord Party, became prominent in İstanbul. Under these conditions, unionist newspapers tried to continue their publication life under the strict oppression of opponent newspapers.

⁵ Falih Rifki Atay, *Çankaya*, (İstanbul: SENA Matbaası, 1980), p. 131-132.

It is important to notice that İstanbul press in the Armistice (October 30, 1918 – May 19, 1919) had its own characteristic and followed a publication policy, which was distinguished from the policy in the period of Turkish National Struggle (May 19, 1919 – October 11, 1922). That is, media organs were influenced by the political atmosphere of the Armistice and started to publish editorials and columns which called for foreign aid and mandate system. Especially some anti-nationalist and collaborative newspapers, such as *Alemdar*, *Peyam-ı Sabah*, and *Türkçe İstanbul*, which took the support of both the Allies and the İstanbul Government, strongly supported the mandate administration of Britain as the solution for the liberation and development of the country. In addition to these, even the most influential newspapers, such as *Tasvir-i Efkar*, *Vakit*, *İfham*, *İkdam*, *Akşam*, and *Yeni Gün*, wanted to be implemented mandate system in the country. These newspapers assertively supported to obtain foreign aid especially from the USA and recommended the American mandate as the best administration for Turkey because it had been considered as the most powerful and developed country. In fact, İstanbul press during the Armistice was hopeless to realize the independence of the country and they believed that the survival and unity of the country could be achieved by means of a great power.⁶ Newspapers in İstanbul continued to advocate the idea of mandate system until the beginning of the National Struggle.

The stated influential newspapers, like *Tasvir-i Efkar*, *İkdam*, *Vakit*, *Akşam*, *İfham* and *Yeni Gün*, tended to give support to the National movement because they started to believe the absolute victory of Turkish National Struggle in Anatolia especially from the beginning of 1921. Thus, these newspapers tried to justify the National movement through effective publications. However, anti-nationalist newspapers, like *Peyam-ı Sabah*, *Türkçe İstanbul*, and *Alemdar*, continued cooperating with Allied Powers and favoring the British and American mandate system. These papers thought that the liberation of the country was possible by reconciliation with Allies. Therefore, they took opponent and pessimistic attitude against the National movement.⁷

⁶ E. Semih Yalçın, *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Tarihinin Kaynakları*, (Ankara: Berikan Yayınları, 2015), p. 162.

⁷ Uğur Gündüz, "Kurtuluş Savaşı'nda Yerel Basının Rolü", Suat Sezgin (editor), *Türkiye'de Yerel Basın*, (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Yayınları, 2007), 93.

Meanwhile, İstanbul press both in the Armistice and in the period of Turkish National Struggle was not independent because the arms of the journalists, who sincerely and heartily prompted the movement of Turkish War of Independence, were often hog-tied with the censorship of the Sultan and government pressures.⁸ It was a common practice to close down newspapers by an order of the government. Then, the same paper appeared under a different name or merged with another paper. For instance, *Tasvir-i Efkar* took the names of *Yeni Tasvir-i Efkar* and *Tevhid-i Efkar* and *Ati* changed its name as *İleri* and *Vakit* had to use different names like *Muvakkit* and *Evkat* due to their favorable publications towards Anatolian resistance. In addition to this, İstanbul press had already been under the pressure of the İstanbul Government. It was also restrained by the oppression and censorship of the Allied Powers since they had landed in İstanbul (November 13, 1918). Now, both the Allies and the İstanbul government censored newspapers and put restrictions on the journalists not only in the Armistice but also in the period of Turkish National Struggle.⁹ The government and the Allies did not allow the press to keep going their publications freely. Therefore, İstanbul press under occupation could not put its full weight at the side of the National movement in the earlier stages of Turkish War of Independence. Due to lack of free atmosphere, some newspapers in İstanbul were published on blank pages. The pressure and censorship left the members of the press desperate. Journalists could not make a conscious broadcast and could not utter their voices as needed. In the course of this disaster period, the silence of İstanbul press towards developments in Anatolia was frequently criticized by the Anatolian press.¹⁰

It is also important to mention the fact that many famous newspapers published in İstanbul, such as *İkdam*, *İleri*, *Tasvir-i Efkar*, *Vakit*, *Akşam*, *İfham* and *Yeni Gün*, resisted against sanctions and oppression of the Allies and Ottoman government and they kept going their supports to the independence movement in spite of all unfavourable political atmospheres in İstanbul. These nationalist newspapers could publish many editorials, columns, and declarations, which emphasized the legitimacy of the Anatolian resistance movement by ignoring heavy censorship. Actually, these

⁸ İzzet Öztoprak, *Türk ve Batı Kamuoyunda Milli Mücadele*, (Ankara: TTK, 2014), p. 16.

⁹ Yücel Özkaya, *Milli Mücadele'de Atatürk ve Basın*, (Ankara: AAMY, 1989), p. 11.

¹⁰ Öztoprak, *Ibid.*, pp. 16-17.

newspapers adopted a particular attitude even publishing blank pages. From that perspective, it is very meaningful for İstanbul newspapers to broadcast blank lines instead of writing other articles. It is very noteworthy to publish empty columns because these empty pages showed that İstanbul and Anatolian press were emotionally joined in the struggle.¹¹

Due to the pressures and censorship of both the Ottoman Government and Allies, İstanbul newspapers could give limited information about the National Forces (Kuvay-ı Milliye), Turkish War of Independence, Mustafa Kemal Pasha and other developments until the beginning of 1921. The reason for starting to mention from this date stemmed from the hopeful developments and victories, such as successful campaigns against Armenians in the East, victories of the First Battle of İnönü (January 9-11, 1921), the Second Battle of İnönü (March 26-31, 1921), the Battle of Sakarya (August 23 - September 13, 1921), signing of Moscow Treaty of Friendship with Soviet Russia (March 16, 1921) and signing of the Treaty of Ankara with France (October 21, 1921).¹² All these achievements of the National Forces strengthened the hands of nationalist newspapers in İstanbul and increased their faiths for decisive victory of Nationalists. For this reason, nationalist media organs in İstanbul started to feel freer to spread information about the legitimacy of the Anatolian resistance movement.

Apart from nationalist newspapers, the most influential the anti-unionist and anti-nationalist newspapers, *Alemdar*, *Peyam-ı Sabah* and *Türkçe İstanbul*, immediately started to criticize severely the unionists and their policies after the signing of Mondros Armistice.¹³ These opponent newspapers accused the unionists of being war criminals because they caused the deaths of millions of people and led to the dismemberment of the country. After the National movement emerged in Anatolia, anti-unionist and anti-nationalist press began to take an aggressive attitude against the Nationalists as well, and made counter propaganda against the Nationalists. For example, the owner and editors of anti-nationalist newspapers, such as Refi Cevat

¹¹ Özkaya, *Milli Mücadele'de Atatürk ve Basın*, p. 12.

¹² Yücel Özkaya, "Milli Mücadele Başlangıcında Basın ve Mustafa Kemal Paşa'nın Basınla İlişkileri", *AAMD*, Vol. I, No. 3 (1985), p. 872.

¹³ Mehmet Nuri İnuğur, *Basın ve Yayın Tarihi*, (İstanbul: Der Yarınları, 2002), p. 341.

(Ulunay), Refik Halid (Karay), Ali Kemal, described the Nationalists as the followers of unionists. Also, they argued that the Anatolian resistance was a new unionist movement. In addition, these journalists continuously claimed that the news unionists, or the Nationalists, were traitor and rebels because they did not obey the will of the Sultan and they desired to drag the people into a new war by encouraging them to resist against the Allied powers.¹⁴ In that way, these writers tried to poison the minds of the people to dissuade them from advocating the Anatolian Resistance movement. In fact, anti-nationalist writers made competition with each other in order to show the Turkish nation as the war criminal.¹⁵ In addition, anti-nationalist newspapers took sides with the İstanbul governments and the Allied powers, both of which provided the free and comfortable environment for anti-nationalist newspapers. These journals were also supported in all aspects. For instance, the Allies and the Ottoman Government supplied with newsprint and ink and gave financial assistance to aforementioned newspapers. The anti-nationalist press did not believe the country could gain its independence; for this reason, the periodicals expected foreign aid and the American and British mandate government system. These papers argued that the American or British patronages were inevitable to prevent the dismemberment of the country.

Now, we will see the most influential nationalist and anti-nationalist newspapers published in İstanbul during the Armistice and the period of the National Struggle. Their conditions, political orientations, their relations with the İstanbul Government, the Nationalists in Anatolia, and themselves, their contents, their circulation etc. will be examined.

¹⁴ Öztoprak, *Ibid.*, pp. 66-67.

¹⁵ Bünyamin Ayhan, "Olağanüstü Durumlarda Toplumsal Dayanışma ve Bütünleşmeye Basının Katkısı: Milli Mücadele Dönemi Türk Basını", (U.D.D.), (Konya: Selçuk Üniversitesi, 2005), p. 166.

2.1.1. The Nationalist Newspapers

2.1.1.1. *İkdam* [Working Firmly]:

İkdam began to be published by Ahmet Cevdet (Oran), who was both the editor and the owner of the paper, in İstanbul. It was printed between the dates of July 5, 1894, and December 31, 1928.¹⁶ Ahmet Cevdet had to leave to Switzerland after the 31 March Incident (April 13, 1909) due to his opposition to the CUP. Then, Ali Kemal became the editorial writer of the newspaper on September 5, 1912. However, he gave up working in *İkdam* because he founded his own paper, *Peyam* in 1913. Yakup Kadri (Karaosmanoğlu) began to manage *İkdam*.¹⁷ The paper was issued daily. *İkdam* was originally issued as four pages from July 5, 1894; however, it had to continue to be printed as two pages after October 6, 1919, because of insufficient materials and financial difficulties. It is also worth to mention that many issues of the newspaper were printed blank due to heavy censorship. The majority of foreign news was obtained from the minority press, like Armenian and Greek newspapers.¹⁸ Many distinguished writers, such as Babanzade İsmail Hakkı, Hüseyin Cahit (Yalçın), Ali Reşat, Ahmet Rasim, Ahmet Refik and Hüseyin Rahmi (Gürpınar), Ali Kemal, formed the editorial staff of *İkdam*.¹⁹

İkdam followed a middle way until the mid of 1920 in terms of the National resistance in Anatolia. Actually, it was not sure whether National resistance would sustain against the Armenians in the East and the Greeks in the West until this time. However, *İkdam* started to believe the National Forces could reach great victory and became one of the defenders of the National movement in İstanbul. Moreover, *İkdam* was the first İstanbul newspaper to send a reporter to Ankara.²⁰ Yakup Kadri went to Ankara on July 2, 1921. He had an interview with Mustafa Kemal Pasha on July 17,

¹⁶ Hamza Çakır, *Osmanlıda Basın-İktidar İlişkileri, (Azınlık Basını, Türkçe Basın ve Dış Basın)*, (Ankara: Siyasal Kitabevi, 2002), p. 109.

¹⁷ Mithat Atabay, *Türk Basın Tarihi; 1981'den Günümüze Türk Basını Tarihi ve Gazeteciler*, (Edirne: Paradigma Akademi Yayınları, 2015), p. 66.

¹⁸ A. Kadir Karahan, "Milli Mücadele Basını", (U.M.T.), (İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi, 1988), p. 35; Atabay, *Ibid.*, p. 66; İnuğur, *Ibid.*, p. 347.

¹⁹ Yalçın, *Ibid.*, p. 166.

²⁰ Çakır, *Ibid.*, p. 110; Öztoprak, *Ibid.*, p. XVIII.

1921, and he published his interviews in *İkdam* in spite of the intense censorship.²¹ Yakup Kadri praised for the National Forces as follows: “Today, there is the army of İsmet Pasha in the Valley of Sakarya, where Kılıçarslan had opposed to the Crusaders 800 years ago.” (800 yıl önce Sakarya Vadisi’nde Haçlılara karşı koyan Kılıçarslan’ın yerinde, bugün İsmat Paşa’nın ordusu var).²²

2.1.1.2. *İfham* [Recital]:

İfham began to be published by Ahmet Ferit (Tek), who was the editor of the paper at the same time, in İstanbul. As a political newspaper, *İfham* was published from September 22, 1912, to March 6, 1920. The newspaper started to use the Printing House of *Yeni Gün* after July 23, 1919, due to its financial difficulties. *İfham* was an illustrated paper and it was printed daily. Yusuf Kenan (July 23, 1919 - January 5, 1920), Hüseyin Ragıp (January 11, 1920 - February 23, 1920), and Hasan Vehbi (February 25, 1920 - March 6, 1920) were presented as the responsible managers of the newspaper.²³ *İfham* also carried out the duty of being the media organ of the National Turkish Party (Milli Türk Fırkası) from December 9, 1919.²⁴

Ahmet Ferit (Tek), Mehmet Emin (Yurdakul), Yusuf Akçuraoğlu, Hamdullah Suphi (Tanrıöver), Ömer Seyfettin, İzzet Ulvi, and Falih Rıfkı (Atay) were involved in the editorial staff of *İfham*.²⁵

İfham faithfully supported the Ankara Government and it was one of the rare newspapers, which strongly emphasized the legitimacy of the National resistance in the leadership of Mustafa Kemal Pasha.

²¹ Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu, *Ergenekon: Milli Mücadele Yazıları*, (İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1964), pp. 58-65.

²² *İkdam*, No.8751, 25 Temmuz 1337 [25.07.1921], p. 1.

²³ Bilgen Yetkin, “Milli Türk Fırkası’nın Sesi İfham Gazetesi’nin Mütareke Dönemine Bakışı (1919-1920)”, *Uluslararası Tarih ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, No. 7 (2012), p. 2.

²⁴ Milli Türk Fırkası was established in the executive office of *İfham* on December 9, 1919, in İstanbul. Founder and managers of Milli Türk Fırkası were consisted important personages, such as Ahmet Ferit (Tek) Bey (Former Deputy of Kütahya), Poet Mehmet Emin (Yurdakul) (Former Deputy of Mosul), Ahmet Hikmet Bey, Zühtü İnhan, Yusuf Akçuraoğlu (Professor of Political History), İsmail Hakkı (Baltacıoğlu) Bey, Mehmet Emin (Erişirgil) Bey. See Yetkin, *Ibid.*, p. 2.

²⁵ Yetkin, *Ibid.*, p. 2.

2.1.1.3. *Tasvir-i Efkar* [Description of Thoughts]:

Tasvir-i Efkar began to be published by İbrahim Şinasi in İstanbul. The newspaper maintained its broadcasting life from June 28, 1862, to March 5, 1925.²⁶ The administration of *Tasvir-i Efkar* continuously changed and the important writers, such as Şinasi (1862-1865), Namık Kemal (1865-1867), Recaizade Mahmud Ekrem (1867-1909) and Ebuzziya Tevfik (1909-1913), periodically carried out this duty from 1862 to 1913.²⁷ Two sons of Ebuzziya Tevfik, Talha and Velid Ebuzziya took over the administration of *Tasvir-i Efkar* on January 19, 1913, upon the death of Ebuzziya Tevfik. Besides, Yunus Nadi (Abalıoğlu) also joined in the editorial staff of *Tasvir-i Efkar* and Velid and Yunus Nadi published this paper together during the years of the First World War (1914-1918).²⁸ However, Yunus Nadi left *Tasvir-i Efkar* by the end of August in 1918 and he began to publish his own paper called *Yeni Gün* from September 2, 1918. Velid Ebuzziya kept going to print *Tasvir-i Efkar* daily. Yet, Velid was arrested and exiled in Malta on March 23, 1920. *Tasvir-i Efkar*, which continued to be published for a while, was closed on April 17, 1921, due to the heavy oppression on the press. Approximately one year later, Britain released some prisoners including journalists according to the agreement made between the Ankara Government and Britain in March 1921 and Velid Ebuzziya came back to İstanbul from Malta. Then, he began to publish again *Tasvir-i Efkar* under the name of *Tevhid-i Efkar* from June 2, 1921. The journal cited much news from the French press. This journal continued its broadcasting life until March 5, 1925. The

²⁶ Necdet Hayta, *Tarih Araştırmalarına Kaynak Olarak Tasvir-i Efkar Gazetesi (1278/1862-1286/1869)*, (Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı, 2002), p. 6.

²⁷ Kenan Demir, "Osmanlı'da Basının Doğuşu ve Gazeteler", *Iğdır Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, No. 5 (2014), p. 74.

²⁸ Zekeriya Sertel cited that "I started to work in *Tasvir-i Efkâr* with the help of Yunus Nadi, whom I had known from Thessaloniki. At that time, *Tasvir-i Efkâr* was the most read among the newspapers published in İstanbul. The editor was Yunus Nadi but the original owner of the journal was Velid Ebuzziya. He was also the man, who gave soul to the newspaper. Velit Ebuzziya studied in Paris. He was a young, decent and kind man. He was a good journalist as well. He was drawing the attention of his readers with the innovations he made every day in the newspaper but he was a very reactionary man. Velid attached importance to the issues which tickled up readers' religious sentiments. Yunus Nadi was the writer of the CUP, but Ebuzziya did not touch his writings. Yunus Nadi was fighting with proponents of Freedom and Accord Party in his own column, but Velit was not involved in this fighting". M. Zekeriya Sertel, *Hatırladıklarım*, (İstanbul: Yaylacık Matbaası, 1968), p. 25.

Independence Court in İstanbul closed *Tevhid-i Efkar* on March 6, 1925, because of its harmful political publications against the Republican regime.²⁹

The editorial staff of *Tasvir-i Efkar* was consisted of many famous intellectuals, such as Ahmet Rasim, Mehmet Agah, Agah Sabri, Mustafa Nazmi, Cenap Şehabattin, Ruşen Eşref (Ünaydın), Abdülhak Hamit (Tarhan) Ahmet Refik (Altınay), Yahya Kemal (Beyatlı) and Süleyman Nazif.³⁰

As one of the most influential newspapers in İstanbul, *Tasvir-i Efkar* courageously supported the Anatolian resistance movement and it could publish many articles, which praised this National resistance, without hesitation in spite of the heavy censorship and oppression on the press in İstanbul. For example, Velid Ebuzziya³¹ did not hesitate to write: “Anatolian resistance proved that the Turkish nation was determined to survive.”³² He also wrote in the issue dated on July 27, 1921, that “we continue to fight until we succeed”.³³ Apart from these, Velid Ebuzziya assigned Ruşen Eşref (Ünaydın) Bey as the correspondent of *Tasvir-i Efkar* and Kenan Bey as the photographer and sent them to Sivas in October 1919 to have an interview with leaders of the National movement.³⁴ *Tasvir-i Efkar* was the first gazette, which published a picture and short life story of Mustafa Kemal Pasha during the National Struggle. Moreover, Velid sent a reporter to the Western Front in order to spread the information about the Anatolian resistance movement daily.³⁵

²⁹ Hıfzı Topuz, *II. Mahmut'tan Holdinglere Türk Basın Tarihi*, (İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 2003), p. 116.

³⁰ Yalçın, *Ibid.*, pp. 164-165.

³¹ Velid Ebuzziya was a patriotic and courageous journalist who could dare to say that *legitimate government was in Anatolia* before the Martial Court managed by Kürt Mustafa Pasha, who was completely against the National movement. Furthermore, Ebuzziya Printing House made a great effort to print secret documents and declarations, which were necessary for the Nationalists. In fact, this printing house secretly served as an institution of M.M. Group or the National Defense Group (Müdafaa-i Milliye Teşkilatı), which was assigned to protect the Turkish population in İstanbul from potential attacks by non-Muslims. *Tasvir-i Efkar* also served as a media organ of this patriotic organization in İstanbul. Velid Ebuzziya himself engaged not only in the press but also he endeavored personally to smuggle war materials from İstanbul to Anatolia with the help of the National Defense Group. He carried ammunition on his back under great risk. See Karahan, *Ibid.*, pp. 24-25; İnuğur, *Ibid.*, pp. 345-346.

³² *Tasvir-i Efkar*, No.2889, 2 Teşrin-i Sani 1335 [02.11.1919], p. 1.

³³ *Tasvir-i Efkar*, No.3080, 27 Temmuz 1337 [27.07.1921], p. 1.

³⁴ Özkaya, “Milli Mücadele Başlangıcında Basın...”, pp. 876-877.

³⁵ Atabay, *Ibid.*, p. 64; Topuz, *II. Mahmut'tan Holdinglere...*, p. 116.

2.1.1.4. *Vakit* [Time]:

Vakit was published by Ahmet Emin (Yalman)³⁶ and Mehmet Asım (Us) together in İstanbul. The newspaper began its broadcasting life on October 26, 1917,³⁷ and it has been published from this date on. *Vakit* was a daily newspaper. Ahmet Emin, Ali Naci (Karacan) and Enis Tahsin (Til) carried out the duty of the editorship of the journal. Necmettin (Sadak), and Kazım Şinasi (Dersan) also worked in *Vakit* before publishing *Akşam*.³⁸

The administration of *Vakit* was left to Mehmet Asım because Ahmet Emin was arrested and exiled in Malta in March 1920. Mehmet Asım maintained to print the journal. However, Ahmet Emin returned to İstanbul approximately a year later and continued to work in *Vakit* for a while. He decided to sell his share to Mehmet Asım. Then, he began to print his own journal, *Vatan* on March 18, 1923.³⁹ *Vakit* took foreign news mostly from American, European and Armenian newspapers.

Meanwhile, Ahmet Şükrü (Esmer), Ali Ekrem (Uşaklıgil), Eniz Tahsin (Til) and Halil Lütfi (Dördüncü) were included in the editorial staff of *Vakit*., Tarık (Us), brother of Mehmet Asım, and Ahmet Rasim were among the writers who regularly sent articles to the newspaper. In addition to those, important writers such as Ruşen Eşref (Ünaydın), Hüseyin Cahit (Yalçın), Ziya Gökalp and Halide Edip (Adıvar) also wrote in this newspaper from time to time.⁴⁰

³⁶ Ahmet Emin started to work as a journalist in the period of Autocracy (İstibdat). During the period of the Constitutional Government in the Ottoman Empire (1908), he was the editor of *Yeni Gazete* (New Gazette). He graduated from doctorate programs of sociology and history in America and he had an internship in the Colombian Journalism School. Ahmet Emin knew three languages and he was the first journalist to have a diploma in the field of journalism. See Ahmet Emin Yalman, *Yakın Tarihte Gördüklerimiz ve Geçirdiklerimiz (1888-1918)*, Vol. I, (İstanbul: Yenilik Basımevi, 1970), pp. 293-294.

³⁷ Yalman, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 296.

³⁸ İnuğur, *Ibid.*, p. 341. “*Vakit* was an influential and very popular newspaper toward the end of the First World War. Ali Naci, Necmettin Sadak and Kazım Şinasi took part in the editorial staff of *Vakit*. The quick success of *Vakit* provided them with the enthusiasm and courage to publish their own newspaper *Akşam*.” See Yalman, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 297.

³⁹ Hıfzı Topuz, *100 Soruda Türk Basın Tarihi*, (İstanbul: Gerçek Yayınevi, 1973), p. 123; Yalman, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 296.

⁴⁰ Topuz, *100 Soruda Türk Basın...*, p. 123.

Vakit was a proponent of the westernization and forward-thinking newspaper. This journal enabled many journalists to gain experience in the field of journalism. *Vakit* was one of the most influential newspapers, which strongly defended the legitimacy of the Anatolian Resistance movement.⁴¹ This paper also printed many articles calling patriotic people for gathering around the National movement. *Vakit* also sent a correspondent to Ankara so as to follow closely the developments in Anatolia. Even Ahmet Emin went to Anatolia to observe the National Resistance movement.⁴²

2.1.1.5. *İleri* [Forward]:

İleri was published by Celal Nuri (İleri) in İstanbul between the dates of January 1, 1918, and December 2, 1924. *İleri* was published under the name of *Ati* until the 393rd issue and it was closed on February 10, 1919, by the İstanbul Government by the reason of criticizing the censorship. However, Celal Nuri changed the name of paper as *İleri* and continued to print it again from February 19, 1919.⁴³ *İleri*, which was published daily, was confronted with many actions of closing. Therefore, Celal Nuri had to use the variety of names so as to maintain publishing this newspaper. For instance, Celal Nuri printed the issues of 1-394 under the name of *Ati*. He could publish the issues of 394-782 under the name of *İleri*. The issues of 782-784 were printed under the name *Ahval*. Lastly, this daily journal began to be published again by name of *İleri* from the 785th issue onward.⁴⁴ Celal Nuri was arrested after the Allied occupation of İstanbul on March 16, 1920. Even though he was exiled from İstanbul to Malta in March 1920, the newspaper continued to be issued in İstanbul.

The important writers, such as Celal Nuri, Süleyman Nazif, Rıza Tevfik, Cevat Rüştü, Ahmet Refik (Altınay), Faik Ali (Ozansoy), Tahsin Nahit, brother of Celal Nuri, Suphi Nuri (İleri), Aka Gündüz, Namık İsmail, Ruşen Eşref (Ünaydın) took

⁴¹ Atabay, *Ibid.*, p. 65.

⁴² Emrah Yıldız, “Hâkimiyet-i Milliye Gazetesi Örneğinde Türk Ulusal Kimliğinin İnşası Süreci (1920-1926)”, (U.M.T.), (Mersin: Mersin Üniversitesi, 2009), p. 100.

⁴³ Topuz, *II. Mahmut’tan Holdinglere...*, p. 102; Atabay, *Ibid.*, p. 66.

⁴⁴ Yalçın, *Ibid.*, p. 165.

part in the editorial staff of *İleri*. The closure date of *İleri* was shown on December 2, 1924.⁴⁵

İleri severely criticized the unionists and the İstanbul Government and it faithfully supported the Anatolian Resistance with articles. This journal was the first newspaper to give information about the news of frontline in Anatolia. Moreover, the Anatolian Government also gave financial support to the newspaper. In fact, *İleri* became the press agency of the National Resistance movement because many news and articles sent by Mustafa Kemal Pasha were published in this journal under the different names.⁴⁶

2.1.1.6. *Yeni Gün* [New Day]:

Yeni Gün began to be published by Yunus Nadi (Abalıoğlu)⁴⁷ in İstanbul. This daily journal was printed between the dates of September 2, 1918, and May 7, 1924. Yunus Nadi was both the owner and editor of *Yeni Gün*.⁴⁸ Yunus Nadi continuously criticized the British policy in his newspaper; therefore, the British High Commissioner in İstanbul started to put pressure on the press, especially on *Yeni Gün*. After the Allied occupation of İstanbul (March 16, 1920), working conditions of journalists in İstanbul were beyond endurance. Yunus Nadi complained about these days in an article dated April 8, 1920: “We were sometimes free, but we were sometimes put into very difficult situations. We could not utter our voices.” Eventually, the British soldiers raided the printing office of Yunus Nadi on March 17, 1920.⁴⁹ Then, the British military officers in İstanbul closed down *Yeni Gün* on

⁴⁵ Yalçın, *Ibid.*, p. 166.

⁴⁶ İnuğur, *Ibid.*, pp. 337-338; Yalçın, *Ibid.*, pp. 165-166; Atabay; *Ibid.*, pp. 66-67.

⁴⁷ Yunus Nadi was the sixth child of Hacı Halil Efendi and Ayşe Hanım, out of seven children. He was born in 1879 in the town Mekri (today called Fethiye). His real name was Ahmet. The name of Yunus Nadi had been given to him by Baba Tahir, owner of *Malumat Gazette*. Although Yunus Nadi took the surname of “Abalıoğlu” in 1936, he often used “Nadi” which means wordsmith, “söz eri”. Pelin Böke, “Yeni Gün”den “Cumhuriyet”e Yunus Nadi”, (U.D.D.), (İzmir: Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, 1994), pp. 2-3.

⁴⁸ Nurettin Gülmez, *Kurtuluş Savaşı’nda Anadolu’da Yeni Gün*, (Ankara: AAMY, 1999), p. 1; Yıldız, *Ibid.*, p. 99.

⁴⁹ Topuz, *100 Soruda Türk Basın...*, p. 123.

March 26, 1920, due to its criticisms against the British policy and its support to the National movement. That's why; Yunus Nadi decided to transfer his printing house to Ankara on April 13, 1920. In this way, *Yeni Gün* started to be printed again on August 10, 1920, in Ankara under the name of *Anadolu'da Yeni Gün*.⁵⁰ *Yeni Gün* was the first daily newspaper published in Ankara during that time.

However, Yunus Nadi had to transfer his printing house from Ankara to Kayseri during the days of Battle of Sakarya (August 22 - September 13, 1921) in case of possible Greek occupation. The first issue of *Yeni Gün* in Kayseri was published on September 1, 1921. It is clear from the collections of *Yeni Gün* that Yunus Nadi printed totally 31 issues in Kayseri. He could come back to Ankara after the Turkish army achieved the great victory.⁵¹ Meanwhile, *Yeni Gün* took foreign news mostly from French and Soviet Russia press.

The editorial staff of *Yeni Gün* was consisted of famous writers, such as Hamdi Nebizade, Ahmet Haşim, Selim Nüzhet (Gerçek), Şükrü (Kaya), Zekeriya (Sertel), Ziya (Gökalp), Kemal Ragıp,⁵² Enver Behnan (Şapolyo) and Adil (Akbay).⁵³

Yeni Gün was one of the strongest and most qualified newspapers in the period of the National Struggle. This journal tried to reflect the thoughts of Mustafa Kemal Pasha and defended the National Pact (Misak-ı Milli). Yunus Nadi, who justified the National resistance, expressed his thoughts with the subhead of the journal during the period of the National Struggle: "Greece must be destroyed" (Yunanistan

⁵⁰ Hakan Aydın, "Sakarya Savaşı'nda Anadolu'da Yeni Gün", *Selçuk Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Akademik Dergisi*, Vol. VI, No. 2 (2010), p. 219-220; Gülmez, *Ibid.*, p. 1. The newspaper began to be published towards the end of the First World War. With the advent of the Armistice, the heavy censorship on the press caused to be closed frequently the journals. For this reason, Yunus Nadi had to change the name of the journal and he published it under the name of *Eski Gün* from September 1918 to March 1919. Due to the severe censorship and oppression of the Allied forces, *Yeni Gün* was completely closed and Yunus Nadi was detained in Bekirağa Ward until October 1919. Then, he was released and continued to publish *Yeni Gün* from October 11, 1919. However, he had to transfer his printing house to Anatolia on April 12, 1920, because of the Allied occupation of İstanbul. Since 10 August 1920, *Yeni Gün* continued its publication life as *Anadolu'da Yeni Gün*. See Böke, *Ibid.*, p. 40.

⁵¹ Gülmez, *Ibid.*, p. 1; Öztoprak, *Ibid.*, pp. XVIII-XIX.

⁵² Yıldız, *Ibid.*, p. 99.

⁵³ Topuz, *100 Soruda Türk Basın...*, pp. 129-130.

yıkılmalıdır!). *Yeni Gün* provided enthusiasm for the Turkish people to fight against the Greeks.⁵⁴

2.1.1.7. *Akşam* [Evening]:

Akşam started to be published in İstanbul by Ali Naci (Karacan), Falih Rıfki (Atay), Kazım Şinasi (Dersan) and Necmettin (Sadak), who were considered as important personages of the Turkish press. *Akşam* was published daily. The first issue of the newspaper dated September 20, 1918, and it has continued to be published at the present time.⁵⁵ The prominent figures of the journal were Falih Rıfki (Atay) and Necmeddin (Sadak) both in the period of National Struggle and Republic.⁵⁶

Akşam tried to follow a balanced publication policy since the early days of the Armistice so as to avoid any attempt causing to be closed the newspaper. In this respect, the newspaper was not directing heavy criticisms on the Ottoman Government and the political developments. *Akşam* focused on the issues related to the nation and the country until the National Struggle emerged in Anatolia. After starting of the National movement, the publication policy of the journal changed and the editorial staff of *Akşam* began to support the National Forces and the activities of Mustafa Kemal Pasha.⁵⁷ Especially by the end of 1920, the newspaper took sides with the Ankara Government and obviously justified the Anatolian resistance.

⁵⁴ İnuğur, *Ibid.*, p. 340.

⁵⁵ Nurhan Kavaklı, *Bir Gazetenin Tarihi Akşam*, (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2005), p. 16; Atay, *Ibid.*, p. 131.

⁵⁶ After leaving of Falih Rıfki and Ali Naci from the newspaper, Necmettin Sadak and Kazım Şinasi managed together *Akşam* for a long time. Necmettin Sadak, who graduated from Galatasaray High School and Lyon University Faculty of Literature and also gave lectures in Darülfünun for a while, was the strongest editorial writer of his time. He was then elected as a deputy from Sivas and served as Foreign Ministry from 1947 to 1950. See İnuğur, *Ibid.*, p. 339.

⁵⁷ In particular, Falih Rıfki wrote many articles criticizing those who opposed the National Struggle under the heading of "Episodes of the Day" (Günün Fıkraları). For this reason, he was put on trial by the Court-Martial (Divan-ı Harb) managed by Kürt Mustafa Pasha, who was against both the unionists and the National movement. Falih Rıfki was accused of being partisan of the National Forces and was arrested. He could be released after staying detained for 88 days. See İnuğur, *Ibid.*, p. 339.

Moreover, the newspaper sent Bilal (Akbay) Bey as the correspondent to Ankara in order to follow closely the developments in Anatolia.⁵⁸

2.1.1.8. *Hadisat* [Events]:

The newspaper began to be published by Mehmet Tevfik Efendi in İstanbul. *Hadisat* was published daily between the dates of October 20, 1918, and June 23, 1919. Cenab Şahabeddin and Süleyman Nazif were presented as the editors of the journal.⁵⁹ *Hadisat* was one of the most important nationalist newspapers even though its broadcasting life was lasted a short time.

Apart from those nationalist newspapers, mentioned above, there were also other newspapers that sympathized with the Anatolian Resistance movement. These journals were not be used because the most of their collections were deficient. That's why they did not have regular and complete issues of the issues. Moreover, the available collections, which had been examined, do not have reasonable amount of materials that is needed to form completeness in terms of this study. Additionally, the most of these journals had already been published in very short time.

Minber [The Pulpit]: This journal began to be published by Mustafa Kemal Pasha and Fethi (Okyar) Bey. The first issue of *Minber* was published October 31, 1918, one day after the signing of Mondros Armistice. Dr. Rasim (Talay) was presented as the director of *Minber*. Fethi Bey became the editor of the newspaper. The newspaper, despite the defeat in the First World War, was trying to give morale to the public. *Minber* was opposed to the mandate system and it made counter propaganda against the unionists. The newspaper closed on December 20, 1918, by reason of financial problems.⁶⁰

⁵⁸ Funda Selçuk Şirin, "Falih Rifki Atay (1893-1950)", (U.M.T.), (Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi, 2009), p. 93.

⁵⁹ Yalçın, *Ibid.*, p. 170; Topuz, *II. Mahmut'tan Holdinglere...*, p. 118.

⁶⁰ Topuz, *II. Mahmut'tan Holdinglere...*, pp. 117-118.

İstiklal [Independence]: This newspaper started to be published by Rauf Ahmet (Hotinli) in İstanbul. The broadcasting life of *İstiklal* continued from December 23, 1918, to November 16, 1919.⁶¹

Memleket [Homeland]: This journal was published by İsmail Hami (Danişmend) in İstanbul. *Memleket* was printed daily between the dates February 10, 1919, and August 14, 1919. *Memleket* was the first newspaper, which refused the idea of mandate system and supported the National movement.⁶²

2.1.2. The Anti-Nationalist Newspapers

2.1.2.1. *Türkçe İstanbul* [Turkish İstanbul]:

Türkçe İstanbul started to be published by Sait Molla in İstanbul from November 9, 1918, with the name *Yeni İstanbul*. *Türkçe İstanbul* was daily newspaper maintained its broadcasting life until 1921. Süleyman Radi was presented as the editor of the newspaper until December 6, 1918, when Süleyman Radi broke off the relations with the paper. From then on, Sait Molla became the director and editor of the newspaper. Besides, the name of the journal changed *Türkçe İstanbul* on December 8, 1918.⁶³

Türkçe İstanbul took sides with the İstanbul Government and severely criticized the National movement. In this regard, Sait Molla made a great effort to challenge with the National Forces with almost all of his articles. Furthermore, he opposed against the nationalist press and secret organizations, which served the aims of the National movement in Anatolia.⁶⁴

⁶¹ Server Rifat İskit, *Türkiye Matbuat İdareleri ve Politikaları*, (Ankara: Başvekâlet Basın ve Yayın Umum Müdürlüğü, 1943), p. 199.

⁶² Yalçın, *Ibid.*, p. 170.

⁶³ *Eski Harfli Türkçe Süreli Yayınlar Toplu Kataloğu*, Vol. I, (Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Milli Kütüphane Başkanlığı Yayınları, 1987), p. 295; Yalçın, *Ibid.*, p. 172.

⁶⁴ Bülent Varlık, "Mütareke ve Milli Mücadele Basını", *Tanzimattan Cumhuriyete Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. 5 (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları), p. 1202.

As Ali Kemal, Refi Cevad (Ulunay) and Refik Halit (Karay) believed, Sait Molla also argued that the liberation of the country would only be possible by the British mandate government. He did not even hesitate to reveal his English admiration with his articles. On this point, Sait Molla expressed his feelings by saying that “the British patronage was the only remedy that would save the future of our country. The nation had to ask for British patronage without wasting time.” (Milletimizin hal ve istikbalini kurtaracak yegane care İngiliz himayesidir. Millet zaman geçirmeden İngiliz himayesini istemelidir.)⁶⁵ Moreover, Said Molla wrote as the subtitle of *Türkçe İstanbul*, pro-British Daily Newspaper (İngiliz Taraftarı Günlük Gazete).⁶⁶

2.1.2.2. *Alemdar* [Flag-Bearer]:

Alemdar started to be published by Ahmet Kadri, also known Pehlivan Kadri in the history of Turkish press, and Refi Cevad (Ulunay),⁶⁷ in İstanbul from 1911. However, *Alemdar* was closed and Refi Cevad was exiled in different provinces like Sinop, Çorum, and Konya because of political developments, which occurred after the assassination of Mahmut Şevket Pasha in 1913. After five-year banishment, Refi Cevad returned to İstanbul and he started again to publish *Alemdar* from December

⁶⁵ *Türkçe İstanbul*, May 20, 1919, p. 1. Sait Molla was a member of the Council of State. He was known as the enemy of the unionist. He was also the founder of the Ottoman Peace and Salvation Society (*Osmanlı Sulh ve Selamet Cemiyeti*). In his newspaper, Said Molla was writing that the salvation of Turkey could be only provided by British patronage, not America. He was already a founding member of the Society of the Friends of England (İngiliz Muhipleri Cemiyeti), Damat Ferit Pasha, Ali Kemal and Priest Frew were also included in founding members of this Society. Varlık, Ibid., p. 1202; Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, *Nutuk (1920-1927)*, Vol. I, prep. By Zeynep Korkmaz and İsmet Gönülal, (Ankara: Başbakanlık Basımevi, 1984), p. 5.

⁶⁶ For detailed information, See Fatih Mehmet Sancaktar, “Said Molla ve Türkçe İstanbul”, (U.M.T.), (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi, 1996).

⁶⁷ Refi Cevad was born in 1890 in Damascus. He was the son of Muhittin Pasha, an old Governor of Ankara. He had the education of primary school in Vefa, Taşmektep and he took secondary education in a private school called Şemsülmaarif. After finishing Galatasaray High School in 1909, he worked in both *Tanin* and *İkdam*. Then, he went into politics by joining in the Freedom and Accord Party, which was opposed to the CUP. Refi Cevad, who managed *Şahrah* Gazette for a while, and Pehlivan Kadri together started to publish *Alemdar*, which would be recognized for its hard opposition against the CUP, in 1911. For more detailed information, See Necmi Uyanık-Sebahattin Mıhçı, “Refi Cevad’ta Siyasi Düşüncenin Değişimi Üzerine”, *Uluslararası Tarih ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, No. 12 (2014), pp. 315-329.

15, 1918.⁶⁸ *Alemdar* was published daily until the end of September 1922. Just under the head, it was written that “it is published in the mornings every day and is a free-thought Ottoman newspaper.” (Her gün sabahları neşrolunur müstakil ül-efkar Osmanlı gazetesidir).⁶⁹ The newspaper was confronted time to time by action of closing and it had to continue its broadcasting life under different names, such as *Takvimli Gazete* and *Teşrih*.⁷⁰ *Alemdar* cited foreign news mostly from the British press and Armenian newspapers.⁷¹

Refik Halit (Karay), Ahmet Kadri, Hafız İsmail, Doktor Selahattin and Mustafa Sabri took part in the editorial staff of *Alemdar*. In addition to them, Sait Molla, Aka Gündüz, and Cenab Şahabeddin worked in this newspaper.⁷²

Alemdar was the proponent of the İstanbul Government. The subhead of *Alemdar* was very meaningful in terms of its political orientation because it started to use subtitle; “Proponent of constitutional sultanate” (Saltanat-ı Meşruta Taraftarıdır) with its issue dated as March 28, 1921.⁷³ Moreover, the newspaper, which supported the British mandate system, argued that the salvation of the Ottoman Empire would be with the British aid and it specifically emphasized this point in various writings. For example, Refi Cevad said that “which way in policy? England had never gone bankrupt so far and does not go bankrupt. We know that our interests are existed in the main policy, which England and its allies would introduce to us.” (Siyasette hangi yol? İngiltere şimdiye kadar hiç iflas etmemişti, edemez. Çıkarlarımızı, İngiltere’nin müttefikleriyle bize açacakları ana siyasette görüyoruz.)⁷⁴ In his another article, he claimed that “we are waiting for the English. Turks do not reform by themselves. The English will save us by helping. In İstanbul, 40.000 signatures were collected within 24 hours for the British mandate system.” (İngilizleri bekliyoruz. Türkler kendi güçleriyle adam olamaz. İngilizler elimizden tutarak bizi kurtaracak.

⁶⁸ Alper Ersaydı, “*Alemdar* Gazetesine Göre Mütareke Dönemi Başında İttihatçılar ve İttihatçılık”, (U.M.T.), (Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi, 2007), p. 9; Topuz, *II. Mahmut’tan Holdinglere...*, p. 110.

⁶⁹ *Alemdar*, No.1-1316, 15 Kanun-i Evvel 1334 [15.12.1918], p. 1.

⁷⁰ Yalçın, *Ibid.*, p. 173; Öztoprak, *Ibid.*, p. XX.

⁷¹ Öztoprak, *Ibid.*, p. XX.

⁷² Yalçın, *Ibid.*, pp. 172-173; İnuğur, *Ibid.*, p. 342; Topuz, *II. Mahmut’tan Holdinglere...*, p. 110.

⁷³ *Alemdar*, No.891-3091, 28 Mart 1337 [28.03.1921], p. 1.

⁷⁴ *Alemdar*, No.23-1333, 6 Kanun-i Sani 1335 [06.01.1919], p. 1.

İngiliz mandası için İstanbul'da 24 saat içinde 40 bin imza toplandı.)⁷⁵ Refi Cevad saw Britain as the savior for Turkish people. On this point, he wrote that “England, our only friend, will be our only savior.” (Yegâne dostumuz olan İngiltere, yegâne kurtarıcımız olacaktır.)⁷⁶

Alemdar, which defended the British protectorate, took a stance in support of the İstanbul Government. That's why the journal started to make counter propaganda towards the National Forces after Anatolian resistance movement emerged.⁷⁷ *Alemdar*, which severely criticized the National resistance, interpreted this movement as “aimlessness” and “adventurism”. Moreover, the writers of *Alemdar* declared the supporters of the National movement as the traitor. They called the leaders of the movement as “hooligan” and “leaders of gangsters”. For instance, Refi Cevad wrote that “there were crazy persons in the National movement, excluding Mustafa Kemal Pasha. The homeland remained in the hands of crazy persons.”⁷⁸ He also expressed his thoughts about the Nationalists as follows: “the brigand which acted under the name of the National Forces...”⁷⁹ Moreover, in every article, *Alemdar* defied the Anatolian resistance and defended the claim that this struggle would be futile. In that way, the newspaper tried to dissuade the people from supporting the National movement. Especially, Refik Halit, who used nicknames of “Aydede” and “Kirpi”, continuously underestimated the National movement and ridiculed the National Forces.⁸⁰ He expressed his feelings as follows: “who is the

⁷⁵ *Alemdar*, No.120-1430, 21 Nisan 1335 [21.04.1919], p. 1.

⁷⁶ *Alemdar*, No.158-1468, 30 Mayıs 1335 [30.05.1919], p. 1.

⁷⁷ Topuz, *100 Soruda Türk Basın...*, p. 124. Muhittin Birgen tells in his memories why Refi Cevad started to publish *Alemdar* and why he was an opponent against the Unionist: “... [Refi Cevad] was completely mischievous and disgusting... I allowed him to work in *Tanin* to gain experience... In the early days, I could not understand what morality he had because he was a very good flatterer. Eventually, I saw that it (his morals) was totally zero: His job was to drink and to walk around inappropriate places from nights to days... Sometimes he made impertinence by using the name of the journal. I kept patience for a long time, I wanted to rescue this young man; I got him every movement under the control. However, I realized that nothing was useful, I finally dismissed him. Thereupon, he started to publish *Alemdar* together with Pehlivan Kadri and became a famous dissident.” Muhittin Birgen, *İttihat ve Terakki'de On Sene*, prep. By Zeki Arıkan, (İstanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 2017), pp. 497-498.

⁷⁸ “Mustafa Kemal Paşa değil ama Milli Hareket'in içinde deliler var. Memleket delilerin elinde kaldı.” *Alemdar*, No.314-2615, 26 Teşrin-i Evvel 1335 [26.10.1919], p. 1.

⁷⁹ “Kuvay-ı Milliye adı altında hareket eden eşkiya...” *Alemdar*, No.483-2783, 15 Nisan 1336 [15.04.1920], p. 1.

⁸⁰ Öztoprak, *Ibid.*, p. XX.

savior of the nation that has devastated the laws and torn down the will with the help of weapon of revolution and revolt, and that has emerged and has shouted arrogantly ‘‘I will save the Turk.’’⁸¹ Refik Halit also described the National Pact (Misak-ı Milli) as non-national. In his article dated February 2, 1920, he wrote: ‘‘one more new child: ‘‘the National Pact.’’ Oh my God! It is how ugly and how non-national word.’’⁸²

2.1.2.3. *Peyam-ı Sabah* [Morning News]:

In 1920, *Peyam-ı Sabah* emerged by merging *Sabah*, which began to be published by Mihran (Nakkaşoğlu) in 1876, and *Peyam*, which started to be printed by Ali Kemal in 1913.⁸³ *Peyam-ı Sabah* was published as daily between the dates of January 1, 1920, and September 14, 1922. While Mihran was presented as the owner of the journal, Ali Kemal was presented as the director and editor of the paper.⁸⁴ *Peyam-ı Sabah* took foreign news usually from the European press.

Peyam-ı Sabah adopted an attitude of expecting the British protectorate in terms of salvation of the country. On this point, Ali Kemal claimed that the Ottoman Empire could survive only under the Great Powers. In fact, the state should undergo constitutional evolution with the guarantee of these powers. When the Turks are left alone, they cannot do any more than what the regime of the CUP did. They can fix neither their economy nor their finance.⁸⁵

⁸¹ ‘‘Kimdir bu millet kurtacısı ki, arkadaşları gibi ihtilal ve isyan silahı ile kanunları parçalamış, iradeleri yırtmış, pazu zoruyla meydana çıkmış, gurulu ve emredici ‘‘Türk’ü kurtaracağım’’ diye haykırıyor.’’ *Alemdar*, No.396-2696, 16 Kanun-i Sani 1336 [16.01.1920], p. 1.

⁸² ‘‘Yeni bir yavru daha: ‘Milli Misak.’ Aman Allahım ne çirkin, ne gayrı milli bir kelime.’’ *Alemdar*, No.412-2712, 2 Şubat 1336 [02.02.1920], p. 1.

⁸³ Hadiye Yılmaz, ‘‘Peyam-Sabah Gazetesinde Milli Mücadele’’, (U.D.D.), (İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi, 2014), pp. 19-20.

⁸⁴ Çakır, *Ibid.*, p. 112. Ali Kemal was the son of Çankırılı Balmumcu Ahmed Efendi. He was born in İstanbul in 1867. His real name was Ali Rıza. Because of his admiration for Namık Kemal, he changed his name to ‘‘Ali Kemal’’. Ali Kemal, who earned a livelihood from teaching and trading during years of the First World War, actively went into politics after the Armistice. He served as the Minister of Education and the Minister of Interior in the first and second governments of Damat Ferid Pasha. Uygur Kocabaşoğlu, ‘‘Hürriyet’i Beklerken İkinci Meşrutiyet Basını’’, (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2010), pp. 100-101.

⁸⁵ Atay, *Ibid.*, p. 139. Falih Rıfkı also tells about Ali Kemal: ‘‘Ali Kemal died impecuniously and was not in a temperament to make valet of foreign. Ali Kemal was a man of Tanzimat. He is neither a libertarian nor a nationalist. However, he was the exact ‘national’ of his time with his morality and

Peyam-ı Sabah, which supported İstanbul governments, especially established by Damat Ferid Pasha, openly took a pessimistic attitude against the Anatolian resistance. The most extreme criticism against the National Struggle was directed by Ali Kemal. In the newspaper, he constantly underestimated the leaders of the National movement. Ali Kemal described the Nationalists as “Bolshevik agents”, “bandits”, “brigands” and “rebels”.⁸⁶ For instance, Ali Kemal compared the Nationalists to Jelali. He wrote that “the National Forces should have been treated like how Kuyucu Murat Pasha had treated the Jelali.” (Kuyucu Murat Paşa Celalilere nasıl davranmışsa Kuvay-ı Milliye’ye de öyle davranmak gerekir.)⁸⁷ In another article, Ali Kemal presented the Nationalist as murderers. He said that “we expect justice from our Sultan. These murderers should be punished quickly and violently.” (Padişahımızdan adalet bekleriz. Bu canilerin cezası çabuk ve şiddetli verilmelidir.)⁸⁸ In addition to these, Ali Kemal humiliated the National Forces by saying that “the army of Mustafa Kemal was formed from bandits, looters, criminals.” (Mustafa Kemal'in ordusu haydutlardan, yağmacılardan, sabıkalılardan kuruludur.)⁸⁹ Ali Kemal continued his opposition even around mid of 1922. He wrote that “it was necessary to save the destiny of this nation from the hands of these irregulars.” (Bu milletin yazgısını bu başıbozukların elinden kurtarmak gerekir.)⁹⁰

The next day after the liberation of İzmir was ensured, Ali Kemal wrote an article, the title of which was “Goals were same and they are same”. In this article, he explicitly indicated that he still insisted on his former political thoughts. “We rejoice, but this rejoicing cannot deter us from our political views.” (Seviniyoruz ama bu sevincimiz bizi siyasi içtihadımızdan vazgeçiremez.)⁹¹

After the great victory was achieved, the broadcasting life of *Peyam-ı Sabah* came to end and the journal took the name of *Sabah* on September 12, 1922. Mihran Efendi was left to Europe by the end of September 1922. Ali Kemal was arrested and sent to

style. It was a normal type of people which the day's society raised... Ali Kemal, while he was so Turkish, was against Turkism. He was not a sold man, but a lost man.” See Atay, *Ibid.*, pp. 138-139.

⁸⁶ Topuz, *100 Soruda Türk Basın...*, p. 78.

⁸⁷ *Peyam-ı Sabah*, No.110, 20 Nisan 1336 [20.04.1920], p. 1.

⁸⁸ *Peyam-ı Sabah*, No.119, 29 Nisan 1336 [29.04.1920], p. 1.

⁸⁹ *Peyam-ı Sabah*, No.192, 12 Temmuz 1336 [12.04.1920], p. 1.

⁹⁰ *Peyam-ı Sabah*, No.836, 16 Nisan 1338 [16.04.1922], p. 1.

⁹¹ *Peyam-ı Sabah*, No.980, 10 Eylül 1338 [10.09.1922], p. 1.

İzmit. He was questioned by Nurettin Pasha, who was section commander in İzmit. While Ali Kemal was taken to Ankara to be put on trial, he was lynched by the people in İzmit and died on November 10, 1922.⁹²

2.2. Anatolian Press in the Period of the National Struggle

The Anatolian press in the National Struggle was born and simultaneously developed with the emergence of the National Struggle in Anatolia. However, the Anatolian newspapers were published under poor conditions. For instance, journalists used the simplest printing tools at that time. The printing machinery and supplies were transported by horses and oxcarts. The newspapers did not have professional compositor and typographer as well as no spare part, ink, and paper. Nevertheless, patriotic journalists could maintain to publish their newspapers in order to give the people regular information about what was happening in and outside of the country. They really worked hard to pull the attention of world public opinion on the legitimacy of the National movement. As a matter of fact, the years of the National Struggle for the Anatolian press (1919-1922) were filled with heroism in terms of Turkish Press History.⁹³

As a matter of course, the nationalist press in İstanbul also gave great support the National movement, but İstanbul press was restricted by heavy censorship and oppression of the government and Allied military authorities, especially in the earlier days. However, there is no doubt that the strongest voice, justifying the legitimacy of the Turkish National resistance, was increased by the Anatolian press and patriotic journalists became the vigorous supporters of the National Forces. On this point, it should not be forgotten that the newspapers in Anatolia were published in a free atmosphere comparing to the İstanbul press. In other words, the Anatolian press was not affected from the severe censorship and oppression enforced to the İstanbul because it was far away from the sphere of influence of both the İstanbul Government and the Allied powers. In addition these advantageous, the Anatolian

⁹² Kocabaşoğlu, *Ibid.*, p. 102; Yalçın, *Ibid.*, p. 174.

⁹³ Topuz, *100 Soruda Türk Basın...*, p. 127; Topuz, *II. Mahmut'tan Holdinglere...*, p. 118.

press were closer to the events and other developments. The most of newspapers in Anatolia could gather the news at first hand and the most of the journalists had already witnessed the developments. These opportunities permitted the newspapers to increase their voices strongly and to publish freely.⁹⁴

The most influential and famous newspapers in Anatolia, such as *Öğüt*, *Açıksöz*, *Albayrak*, *İzmir'e Doğru*, *İrade-i Milliye* and *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, took sides with the National Forces and faithfully defended the legitimacy of the National movement.⁹⁵ Especially, after Mustafa Kemal Pasha set foot on Anatolian soil on May 19, 1919, both of the national organization and this Anatolian press gained strength. This movement also prepared the ground for aforementioned newspapers to revive and to gain self-confidence. In this way, the nationalist newspapers began to believe the absolute victory and they expressed their desires of independence with all publications. The common political orientation of the nationalist press in Anatolia during the National Struggle became either “independence or death.”⁹⁶

The nationalist newspapers mentioned above served the purpose of the National Forces. These papers made great effort to strengthen and to spread the spirit of the National Forces over the Anatolian. Also, the nationalist journals tried to pull the attention of Turkish public opinion on the legitimacy of the National Struggle. In this respect, the pro-Nationalist press acted as the spokesman of the Anatolian people during the period of National Struggle. Furthermore, the Anatolian press played an important role in creating unity and solidarity among the Anatolian people. One thing is certain that the pro-Nationalist newspapers in Anatolia formed a different kind of force to gain the support of Turkish public opinion and to achieve victory.⁹⁷

However, there were also certain anti-nationalist newspapers like *Ferda*, *İrşad*, and *Zafer*. These periodicals maintained their broadcasting life by collaborating with the İstanbul Government and minorities. In fact, they published many articles, serving

⁹⁴ Özkaya, *Milli Mücadele'de Atatürk ve Basın*, p. 14.

⁹⁵ İnuğur, *Ibid.*, pp. 352-355; Yalçın, *Ibid.*, pp. 174-175.

⁹⁶ Metin Akız, “Hâkimiyet-i Milliye Gazetesi (1920-1923)”, (U.M.T.), (Manisa: Celal Bayar Üniversitesi, 2006), pp. 19-20.

⁹⁷ Akız, *Ibid.*, p. 19; İnuğur, *Ibid.*, p. 351.

the purpose of the occupiers.⁹⁸ Even though there were many anti-national newspapers published in Anatolia, almost all copies of them were burned or lost. There are few unclassified copies of anti-nationalist journals in the libraries and archives. However, the available anti-nationalist journals, including *Ferda*, *İrşad* and *Zafer* were published in a very short time period. That is, they did not contain necessary and sufficient topics related to the content of this study. For this reason, these newspapers were not included in the study. We will review them in general:

Zafer [Victory]: The newspaper started to be published by Sofizade Mehmet Tevfik in Kastamonu from 1911 to September 17, 1919. Hersekli Mehmet İzzet was presented as the editor of *Zafer*. The paper was published weekly. *Zafer* took sides with the İstanbul Government and criticized the National movement.⁹⁹

Ferda [Tomorrow]: This journal began to be published by Ali İlmi from October 31, 1918, in Adana. *Ferda* was published twice a week and it acted like the spokesman of Freedom and Accord Party in Adana. This journal, which took material aid and spiritual support of French military authorities, severely opposed the National Resistance movement. Moreover, *Ferda* cooperated with French and Armenians and encouraged them to occupy the country. The newspaper continued to be published until 1921.¹⁰⁰

İrşad [Guidance]: This newspaper, also known *Gavurcu İrşad*, began to be published by Kadızade Hulusi and Ömer Fevzi in Balıkesir. The broadcasting life of *İrşad* continued from the mid of August 1920 to September 6, 1922. The paper was published three times in a week. *İrşad* was well-known with its strong opposition against Mustafa Kemal Pasha and the National Forces. Also, the journal tried to introduce the occupation forces as “friends” of the Turkish people. The most of the issues of *İrşad* were lost.¹⁰¹

As we examined the İstanbul press, we will also see the most influential nationalist newspapers published in Anatolia during the period of the National Struggle. Their

⁹⁸ Öztoprak, Ibid., p. XXIV; İnuğur, Ibid., p. 351.

⁹⁹ *Eski Harfli Türkçe Süreli Yayınlar Toplu Kataloğu*, Vol. I, p. 303; Öztoprak, Ibid., p. XXIV.

¹⁰⁰ Yalçın, Ibid., p. 190; İnuğur, Ibid., p. 363.

¹⁰¹ Öztoprak, Ibid., p. XXIV; Yalçın, Ibid., p. 190.

conditions, political orientations, their relations with the leaders of Nationalists Ankara, their contents and their circulation will be introduced.

2.2.1. The Nationalist Newspapers

2.2.1.1. *Öğüt* [Advice]:

Öğüt, which was one of the most influential newspapers published in Anatolia, started to be printed daily by Abdülgani Ahmet (Doyran) from January 2, 1918, in Afyon. However, after the occupation of İzmir by the Greeks, the newspaper had to move to Konya in October 1919. Because of pressures of the British and Italian military authorities, *Öğüt* had to change its name as *Nasihah* on January 26, 1920, in order to continue its broadcasting life.¹⁰² From this date on, *Öğüt* was published up to the 290th issue under the name of *Nasihah*.¹⁰³ Abdülgani Ahmet sent part of his printing press with Feridun (Kandemir) to Ankara in 1921, upon the invitation of the Head Clerk of the Assembly Recep Bey (Peker). In that way, *Öğüt* began to be published daily from July 7, 1921, in Ankara.¹⁰⁴ *Öğüt* was the first newspaper to be published daily in two different cities in the same period.

¹⁰² Atilla Girgin, *Türk Basın Tarihi'inde Yerel Gazetecilik*, (İstanbul: İnkılap Kitbevi, 2001), p. 107. The British military authorities were annoyed with the publications of *Öğüt* because this journal encouraged the people to join the National Resistance movement. For this reason, General Milne, who was the Commander of British Army in the Black Sea, asked the commandship of the Italian union in Konya to close the printing house of *Öğüt* as soon as possible. Then, the Italian soldiers occupied the printing press of the journal and closed it down on January 26, 1920. However, after the closure of the newspaper, the patriotic people organized a mass meeting on January 28, 1920, in Konya. In this meeting, the President of the SDR of Konya Ali Kemali of Sivas shouted that *Today, if they have closed Öğüt, another Öğüt will be published tomorrow, they never and never silence us in the way of truth!* (Bugün, Öğüt'ü kapatmışlarsa, yarın bir başka Öğüt çıkacak, bizi hak ve hakikat yolunda asla ve asla susturamayacaklardır!) In fact, Abdülgani Ahmet continued to publish *Öğüt* under the name of *Nasihah* from January 28, 1920. Hülya Baykal, "Milli Micadele'de Basın", *AAMD*, Vol. IV, No. 11 (1988), pp. 475-476.

¹⁰³ Fuat Süreyya Oral, *Türk Basın Tarihi (1919-1965 Cumhuriyet Dönemi)*, İkinci Kitap, (Ankara: Doğu Matbaası, 1968), p. 49; *Eski Harfli Türkçe Süreli Yayınlar Toplu Kataloğu*, Vol. I, p. 203.

¹⁰⁴ Mehmet Önder, *Milli Mücadelenin Yanında ve Safında Öğüt Gazetesi*, (Ankara: Güven Matbaası, 1986), pp. 23-24.

The owner of the journal was Abdülgani Ahmet. Sadri Ertem Bey was presented as the editor of the journal. Moreover, Enver Behnan (Şapolyo), Münir Müeyyen (Bekman), Lütfü Arif, Raif Nezihi and Celal Davut worked in the newspaper.¹⁰⁵

Öğüt had a reputation as one of the most read and most circulated among other Anatolian newspapers during the period of the National Struggle. Also, this nationalist paper courageously defended the legitimacy of the National Resistance. In this regard, *Öğüt* tried to break the negative effects of the rebellions and minorities on the people with its publications. The subhead of *Öğüt* clearly expressed that it served the purpose of the Turkish nation: “It is daily Turkish newspaper, which is a servant of national desires, respectful of benefits of homeland and free-thought.” (Amal-i Milliyeye hizmetkar, menafi-i vataniyeye hürmetkar ve müstakil’ül-efkar yövmi Türk gazetesidir.)¹⁰⁶ Indeed, *Öğüt* played an important role in succeeding of the National movement with its publications, leading Anatolian people.¹⁰⁷ As the third important newspaper in the Anatolian press in the National Struggle, *Öğüt* continued its broadcasting life both in Ankara and Konya until 1923 and it was closed on May 9, 1923.¹⁰⁸

2.2.1.2. Albayrak [Red Flag]:

Süleyman Necati (Güneri) restarted publishing *Albayrak* on March 5, 1919, in Erzurum. Its first publication period covered the years of 1913 and 1916. This national journal was published twice a week. Its broadcasting life continued until February 14, 1921.¹⁰⁹ *Albayrak* was published totally 131 issues and its circulation

¹⁰⁵ Önder, *Milli Mücadelenin Yanında...* pp. 25-26; İnuğur, *Ibid.*, p. 353.

¹⁰⁶ *Öğüt*, No.1, 2 Kanun-i Sani 1334 [02.01.1918], p. 1.

¹⁰⁷ Yalçın, *Ibid.*, p. 178.

¹⁰⁸ Oral, *Ibid.*, p. 50. Abdülgani Ahmet (Doyran) was saying goodbye *Öğüt*, which he had published in various difficulties for 6 years: “You did your job! Your reward is your honorable and glorious past. Go aside without expecting anything from anyone.” See Önder, *Milli Mücadelenin Yanında...* p. 26.

¹⁰⁹ Hasan Duman, *Osmanlı-Türk Süreli Yayınları ve Gazeteleri (1828-1928)* Vol. I, (Ankara: Enformasyon ve Dokümentasyon Hizmetleri Vakfı, 2000), p. 122; *Eski Harfli Türkçe Süreli yayınlar Toplu Kataloğu*, Vol. I, p. 7.

was about 450.¹¹⁰ Süleyman Necati was also presented as the editor and the director of the newspaper.

Brother of Süleyman Necati, Mithat (Turanlı) Bey, Müştak Sıtkı (Dursunoğlu), Cevad (Dursunoğlu), Machinist İzmirli Arif and Hamza (Demirel) Bey worked the editorial staff of *Albayrak*.¹¹¹

Albayrak opposed the İstanbul Government and defended the legitimacy of the National movement and organizations. Especially, Süleyman Necati made *Albayrak* the spirit of the SDR of Erzurum and the media organ of SDR of Eastern Provinces. In this way, *Albayrak* became the most effective propaganda tool of the Eastern Region. This journal revealed its political orientation by writing that “Eastern provinces cannot be Armenia.” (Vilayat-ı Şarkıyye, Ermenistan olamaz.)¹¹² *Albayrak* was one of the most important historical sources together with *İrade-i Milliye* in the period of the congresses.¹¹³

Albayrak also published articles about Bolshevism and communist principles. At the same time, this journal defined himself as “Turkish People's Newspaper” (Türk Halk Gazetesi).¹¹⁴

2.2.1.3. *Açıksöz* [Outspoken]:

Açıksöz was stated to be published by Mehmet Behçet Bey, the director of Kastamonu High School, Hüsnü (Açıksöz) Bey, Ahmet Hamdi (Çelen), Tahir (Karaoğuz) and high school students since June 15, 1919 in Kastamonu.¹¹⁵ *Açıksöz* continued to be published until 1932. Ahmet Hamdi was the owner of *Açıksöz* and Hüsnü Bey was the director of this journal. Moreover, Hüsnü Bey, İsmail Habib

¹¹⁰ Alaattin Uca, “Erzurum’da Milli Mücadele Döneminde Yayınlanan Albayrak Gazetesi’ndeki İllânlar”, *Atatürk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Dergisi* [TAED], No. 42 (2010), p. 259; Topuz, *II. Mahmut’tan Holdinglere...*, p. 133-134.

¹¹¹ Uca, *Ibid.*, p. 259.

¹¹² *Albayrak*, No.1, 5 Mart 1335 [05.03.1919], p. 1.

¹¹³ Selçuk Ural, “Ali Galip Olayı’nın Milli Mücadele Taraftarı Gazetelerdeki (İrade-i Milliye ve Albayrak) Yankıları”, *Ankara Üniversitesi TİTE-AYD*, No. 29-30 (2002), p. 170; Atabay, *Ibid.*, p. 74.

¹¹⁴ Topuz, *II. Mahmut’tan Holdinglere...*, pp. 133-134.

¹¹⁵ Mustafa Eski, *Kastamonu Basınında Milli Mücadele’nin Yankıları*, (Ankara: TTK, 1995), p. 3.

(Sevük) and Dr. Fazıl (Berki) were periodically presented as the editors of the newspaper.¹¹⁶ *Açıksöz* started initially to be published as one page and once a week and the subhead in the first issue of the newspaper was written that “two pages, for now, a weekly free-thought newspaper.” (Şimdilik iki sahife haftada bir neşrolunur müstakil’ül efkar gazetesidir.)¹¹⁷ However, it started to be printed twice a week from September 16, 1919. Eventually, *Açıksöz* started to be published daily except for Saturday, but the number of pages fell from four to two from March 9, 1921, onward. (Cumartesi gününden mâ-adâ her gün neşrolunur.)¹¹⁸ Furthermore, in 1920, 1921 and 1922, the distribution of the newspaper was greatly enlarged and the circulation of it exceeded 1,500. So, the newspaper became the most influential newspaper in Northwestern Anatolia during the period of the National Struggle.¹¹⁹

İsmail Hakkı (Uzunçarşılı), İsmail Habib, Hasan Fehmi (Turgal), Hüsni Bey, Dr. Fazıl, Abdulahat Nuri, Deputy of Çankırı Talat Bey, Former vice Minister of Education Mustafa Necati and Nizameddin Nazif worked in the editorial staff of *Açıksöz*.¹²⁰ In addition to these writers, Mehmet Akif (Ersoy) also came to Kastamonu on October 19, 1920, and he started to write articles in the newspaper. It is also important to know that *the Independence Anthem* (İstiklal Marşı) was firstly published in the 123rd issue of *Açıksöz*, after *Journal of Sebilü’r-Reşad* in Ankara.¹²¹

Açıksöz was one of the prominent newspapers, supporting the idea of independence and the National movement in Anatolia – as a matter of fact in the region of Western Black Sea. For example, *Açıksöz* helped the National Forces by announcing and implementing *the Orders Respecting Requisitions* (Tekalif-i Milliye Emirleri) in Kastamonu and its environment.¹²² Moreover, this journal addressed to the whole the region of Western Black Sea and it made a significant contribution to the people of

¹¹⁶ Faruk Söylemez, “Milli Mücadele’de Kastamonu Basını”, *Ankara Üniversitesi TİTE-AYD*, Vol. III, No. 12 (1993), pp. 413-414.

¹¹⁷ *Açıksöz*, No.1, 15 Haziran 1335 [15.06.1919], p. 1.

¹¹⁸ *Açıksöz*, No.128, 9 Mart 1337 [09.03.1921], p. 1.

¹¹⁹ Özkaya, *Milli Mücadele’de Atatürk ve Basın*, p. 19-20.

¹²⁰ Eski, *Kastamonu Basınında ...*, p. 3; Topuz, *II. Mahmut’tan Holdinglere...*, p. 128.

¹²¹ Mustafa Eski, “Mütareke Sonrasında Kastamonu’ya Gelen Önemli Kişiler”, *AAMD*, Vol. XV, No. 45 (1999), p. 1052.

¹²² Mücahit Özçelik, “*Açıksöz* Gazetesinde Sakarya Savaşı”, *Tarihin Peşinde Uluslararası Tarih ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, No. 6 (2011), pp. 197-198.

the region in terms of the social and cultural development. With the help of these devotions, *Açıksöz* became the media organ of SDR of Kastamonu.¹²³

Despite the financial impossibilities, *Açıksöz* was sometimes distributed free of charge to the towns and villages in Anatolia to create public opinion on the behalf of the National movement. Moreover, this national journal played an important role in spreading information about the military achievements of the national army. In that way, the newspaper provided the people to unify around the National Resistance. *Açıksöz* was sold even in İstanbul by passing secretly.¹²⁴

2.2.1.4. *İrade-i Milliye* [National Will]:

Mustafa Kemal Pasha and other delegations decided to publish a newspaper, announcing the principles of the National Struggle, in the first days of the Sivas Congress (September 4-11, 1919). The publication of a newspaper was a necessary tool so as to enlighten the Anatolian people and give them regular information about the political conditions and developments.¹²⁵ The next day after the Sivas Congress was concluded, *İrade-i Milliye* started to be published by Demircioğlu Selahattin (Ulusalerk) from September 14, 1919, in Sivas.¹²⁶ Demircioğlu Selahattin was also presented as the director of *İrade-i Milliye*.¹²⁷ Moreover, Mazhar Müfit (Kansu) was

¹²³ Eski, *Kastamonu Basınında ...*, p. 3; Öztoprak, *Ibid.*, p. XXII.

¹²⁴ Murat Yetim, "I. İnönü Zaferi'nden İzmir'in Kurtuluşuna Kadar *Açıksöz* Gazetesi'nde Harici Haberler", (U.M.T.), (Erzincan: Erzincan Üniversitesi, 2015), p. 9.

¹²⁵ Mehmet Rasim (Başara), who also carried out the preparatory work of the Sivas Congress, expressed his observations about this issue as follows: "The idea of publishing a newspaper, which was required to the broad and continuous publications of national motives and developments, had been adopted in negotiations among delegates before the Sivas Congress officially started to work. Vehbi Cem Aşkun, *Sivas Kongresi*, (İstanbul: İnkılap ve Aka Kitabevleri, 1963), p. 161.

¹²⁶ Fatih M. Dervişoğlu, "Milli Mücadele Döneminde Basın ve *İrade-i Milliye* Gazetesi" *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, Vol. II, No. 6 (2009), pp. 160-161.

¹²⁷ Aytül Tamer, *İrade-i Milliye, Ulusal Mücadelenin İlk Resmi Yayın Organı*, (İstanbul: Türkiye Sosyal Tarih Araştırma Vakfı, 2004), p. 35. Demircioğlu Selahattin, who was chosen as the director of the journal with the approval of Mustafa Kemal Pasha, explained the reason of publishing *İrade-i Milliye* as follows: "Mustafa Kemal Pasha regarded a printing newspaper as necessary in order to spread the ideas and decisions of the Sivas Congress, which passed as a brilliant and honorable movement into the Turkish history. It was my honor to receive the privilege of this journal and to take over the responsibility of administration. Mustafa Kemal Pasha gave the name of *İrade-i Milliye* to the newspaper." See Aşkun, *Ibid.*, p. 162

the editor of the newspaper.¹²⁸ Even though it was written that *it is printed twice a week* on the first issue of *İrade-i Milliye*, it could be published generally once a week.¹²⁹ The last issue of the paper, 254th issue, was printed on December 3, 1922. *İrade-i Milliye* was the first official media organ of the National Struggle and it maintained its identity of the official newspaper until the publication of *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* on January 10, 1920, in Ankara. From this date forward, *İrade-i Milliye* continued to be published as a local newspaper in Sivas. However, the collections of the newspaper were burnt in a fire in the Province Printing House in 1921. Therefore, there is no complete collection of this newspaper.¹³⁰

İrade-i Milliye was one of the leading newspapers in the National Struggle. This journal courageously defended the idea of independence and tried to gather Anatolian people around the National movement with its publications. *İrade-i Milliye* made a great effort to take the attention of both the Turkish and world public opinion on the National Resistance movement. It also served to be announced the will of Turkish nation world public opinion. The political orientation of *İrade-i Milliye* was already revealed in the first issue, with its subhead: “It is the defender of the nation’s wishes and demands.” (Metalib ve amal-i milliyenin müdafiidir.)¹³¹

In addition to these, *İrade-i Milliye* served as the spokesman of the National movement. Many of the copies of the newspaper were sent to the societies for the defense of rights, municipalities and other associations for the propaganda of

¹²⁸ Dervişoğlu, *Ibid.*, p. 161; Atabay, *Ibid.*, p. 77.

¹²⁹ When the available issues of *İrade-i Milliye* was examined, it was noticed that this journal could publish 4 issues in September, 5 issues in October, 4 issues in November, 5 issues in December of 1919; 4 issues in January, 4 issues in February, 7 issues in March, 5 issues in April and 2 issues in May of 1920.

¹³⁰ Hüseyin Yıldırım, “İrade-i Milliye Gazetesi”, *AAMD*, Vol. VIII, No. 23 (1992), pp. 329-330; Öztoprak, *Ibid.*, p. XXIII.

¹³¹ *İrade-i Milliye*, No.1, 14 Eylül 1335 [14.09.1919], p. 1. The Director of *İrade-i Milliye*, Selahattin explained the subhead of the newspaper like that: "Our enemies wanted to destroy the Turkish land and put an end to the existence of the Turkish nation. While the Mondros Armistice, which was concluded after the First World War, had left the parts of the lands dwelling by the Turks as a whole, our enemies, who broke their promises, started to invade Turkish cities such as İstanbul, İzmir, Balıkesir, Adana, Antep, Urfa, Samsun and Merzifon and their neighborhoods... That day, “the wishes and demands of the nation” was to clear the enemy from the country. This extensive and general action was indicated as a legitimate war with the Congress of Sivas in September 1919. “*İrade-i Milliye*” became the flagbearer of this national movement in the field of the press.” See Aşkun, *Ibid.*, pp. 162-163.

national resistance. The newspaper was sent to occupied areas in the official stamped envelopes belonging to the branches of education, agriculture, and waqfs, due to the censorship implemented in the occupied areas.¹³² Furthermore, the official reports of the Sivas Congress and the manifestos of Mustafa Kemal Pasha were forwarded to all parts of Anatolia via publications of this newspaper.¹³³

2.2.1.5. *İzmir'e Doğru* [Towards İzmir]:

At the end of the Third Balıkesir Congress, which was held on September 16-22, 1919, delegates emphasized the necessity of a media organ to enlighten the people about the events and developments in Anatolia. For this reason, Hüseyin Vasıf (Çınar), Esat (Çınar) and Mustafa Necati together started to publish *İzmir'e Doğru* since November 16, 1919, in Balıkesir, which was particularly exposed to the Greek occupation during the disastrous period of the National Struggle. The first issue of the newspaper was pressed on November 16, 1919. The printing process of the newspaper was carried out in the *Daire-i Mahsusa*, which belonged to the Headquarters of National Forces in Balıkesir.¹³⁴ *İzmir'e Doğru* was published twice a week and it maintained its broadcasting life until June 27, 1920, when the Greek army occupied Balıkesir and its environment.

The owner of *İzmir'e Doğru* was Esat (Çınar). Also, Hüseyin Vasıf (Çınar) was presented as the director of the journal. Mustafa Necati carried out the duty of editorship of the newspaper. Both Hüseyin Vasıf (Çınar) and Mustafa Necati were among the first ministers of education of the Turkish Republic.¹³⁵

In the first issue, *İzmir'e Doğru* revealed its political orientation in the subhead: “It is the servant and propagator of National movement.” (Harekat-ı Milliye'nin hadim

¹³² Yıldırım, *Ibid.*, p. 327.

¹³³ İnuğur, *Ibid.*, p. 353; Özkaya, *Milli Mücadele'de Atatürk ve Basın*, p. 60.

¹³⁴ Erol Kaya, “Milli Mücadele'de İzmir'e Doğru Gazetesi”, *International Periodical For the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, Vol. III, No. 1 (2008), pp. 297-299.

¹³⁵ Vahdet Keleşılmaz, “Bir Kuva-yı Milliye Gazetesine Göre Türk Barışı ve İngiltere”, *Ankara Üniversitesi TİTE-AYD*, Vol. III, No. 12 (1993), p. 250; Topuz, *100 Soruda Türk Basın Tarihi*, p. 131.

ve mürevvici'dir.)¹³⁶ Moreover, the purpose of the newspaper clearly expressed in this sentence: “The writings, which would defend the national desires, are accepted.” (Amal-i Milliyeyi müdafaa edecek yazılar kabul edilir.)¹³⁷ Indeed, *İzmir'e Doğru* played a very successful role in announcing the purpose of the National Forces to the world public opinion and unifying the people around the National Resistance. That's why *İzmir'e Doğru* acted like the spokesman of the National Forces in Aegean region.¹³⁸ Also, the newspaper, in time, became almost a symbol of resistance to the Greeks.

İzmir'e Doğru published totally seventy four issues between the dates of November 16, 1919, and June 27, 1920. The newspaper had to be closed because of the occupation of Balıkesir by the Greek army June 30, 1920.¹³⁹

2.2.1.6. Hakimiyet-i Milliye [National Sovereignty]:

Hakimiyet-i Milliye started to be printed by Mustafa Kemal Pasha from January 10, 1920, in Ankara. The responsible director was Recep Zühtü (Soyak).¹⁴⁰ Hüseyin Ragıp and Falif Rıfıkı (Atay) were presented as the editors of *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*.¹⁴¹ The newspaper continued its broadcasting life until 1934. From 1934 onwards, the journal was published under the name of *Ulus*.¹⁴² It can be understood from the issues that *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* was published twice a week between the dates of January 10, 1920, and October 30, 1920. Then, the journal was published three days a week since October 30, 1920.

Ağaoğlu Ahmet, Hüseyin Tevfik, Ruşen Eşref (Ünaydın), Doktor Adnan (Adivar), Mahmut Esat (Bozkurt), Doktor Tevfik Rüştü (Aras), Yusuf Akçura, Hüseyin Ragıp

¹³⁶ *İzmir'e Doğru*, No.1, 16 Teşrin-i Sani 1335 [16.11.1919], p. 1.

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 1.

¹³⁸ Yalçın, *Ibid.*, p. 179; İnuğur, *Ibid.*, p. 354.

¹³⁹ Yaşar Özüçetin, “Anadolu Gazetelerinden Biri Olan “İzmir'e Doğru” ve Pierre Loti'nin Gazetedeği Yazıları” *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, Vol. IV, No. 18 (2011), p. 267.

¹⁴⁰ Oral, *Ibid.*, p. 42; Atabay, *Ibid.*, p. 78.

¹⁴¹ Duman, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 349.

¹⁴² *Eski Harfli Türkçe Süreli Yayınlar Toplu Kataloğu*, Vol. I, pp. 91-92.

(Baydur), Ziya Gevher (Etili), Hamdullah Suphi (Tanrıöver), Nafiz Atif (Kansu), Nizamettin Nazif (Tepedelenlioğlu) and İzzet Ulvi worked in *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*.¹⁴³

Hakimiyet-i Milliye, as one of the most influential newspapers in Anatolia, courageously supported the National movement. This periodical also tried to enlighten the Anatolian people and give them exact information about events and developments in and outside of Anatolia. In addition to these, this paper became the media organ of SDR of Anatolia and Rumelia.¹⁴⁴ The decisions of the SDR of Anatolia and Rumelia, as well as the purpose of Turkish War of Independence, were announced with the publications of *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*. In that way, the patriotic writers of the newspaper tried to pull the attention of the world public opinion on the desire of Turkish people for independence. Furthermore, *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* defended the ideas of independence and national sovereignty and endeavored to mobilize the people to join in life and death struggle. In all article, the newspaper brought Turkish people to the forefront as an important factor in independence war. In this regard, the subhead of *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* reflected the summary and essence of its publication policy: “His route to follow is to make the will of the nation dominant.” (Mesleği irade-i milliyeyi hakim kılmaktır.) Moreover, in the first issue of the journal, the purpose of *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* was emphasized as follows:

We have not accidentally given this name to our newspaper, which has been published since the present day and would cover the situations and events related to the whole Anatolia and its circles in its columns. The name of our journal is a kind of struggle to be followed at the same time. We can say that the purpose of *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* is to defend the sovereignty of the nation.¹⁴⁵

Apart from these national newspapers mentioned above, there were also other nationalist Anatolian newspapers, which had no more than a few copies of their issues. **Ahali [People]**: Mehmet Behçet (Perim), September 8, 1919–June 1920, in Edirne. **Ahali [People]**: İsmail Cenani (Oral), 1919-1944, Samsun. **Amal-i Milliye**

¹⁴³ Yalçın, *Ibid.*, p. 177; İnuğur, *Ibid.*, p. 353.

¹⁴⁴ Tefik Çavdar, *İz Birakan Gazeteler ve Gazeteciler, Babıaliden Geriye Ne Kaldı?*, (Ankara: İmge Kitapevi Yayınları, 2007), p. 82; Özkaya, “Milli Mücadele Başlangıcında Basın...”, p. 905.

¹⁴⁵ “Bugünden itibaren mevkii intişara çıkan ve sütunlarında bütün Anadolu ile onu alakadar eden muhitlerin ahval ve hadisatını ihtiva edecek olan gazetemize bu ismi tesadüfi olarak vermedik. Gazetemizin ismi aynı zamanda takip edeceği tarik-i mücahedenin de nev'idir. Şu halde diyebiliriz ki *Hâkimiyet-i Milliye*'nin mesleği milletin müdafaa-i hâkimiyeti olacaktır.” Mehmet Önder, “Milli Mücadele'nin Gazetesi *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* Nasıl Çıkarıldı?”, *AAMD*, Vol. VII, No. 20 (1991), p. 290; *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, No.1, 10 Kanun-i Sani 1336 [10.01.1920], p. 1.

[Wishes of Nation]: Hacı Nuri-Ayaşlızade İsmail Hakkı, April 26, 1920–?, in Kahramanmaraş. **Anadolu [Anatolia]:** Haydar Rüştü, 1921-1922, in Antalya. **Dertli [Sufferer]:** Ahmet Reşat Bey, 1919-1920, in Bolu. **Emel [Wish]:** Mehmet Sırrı, 15 April 1919–November 1919, in Amasya. **Ertuğrul:** Mümtaz Şükrü (Eğilmez)-Ahmet Refik Bey, July 8-December 19, 1920, in Bursa. **Yoldaş [Fellow Traveller]:** İbrahim Hilmi Efendi, October 15, 1919–July 8, 1920, in Bursa. **Hukuk-u Beşer [Rights of Human]:** Osman Nevres (Hasan Tahsin), November 15, 1918–May 1919, in İzmir. **Yeni Dünya [New World]:** Arif Oruç, 1920–1921, in Ankara-Eskişehir. **Yeni Adana [New Adana]:** Ahmet Remzi (Yüreğir)-Yozgatlı Avni (Doğan), December 25, 1918–, in Adana-Pozantı.¹⁴⁶

2.3. News Sources of Newspapers in the National Struggle

2.3.1. Formation of Anatolian Agency (AA)

İrade-i Milliye and *Hâkimiyet-i Milliye* were the spokesmen of the National Resistance movement. They interactively worked with other Anatolian newspapers. These two journals provided information to other newspapers and obtained news from them. However, this kind of publication was not enough to enlighten the people. In that sense, it was compulsory to establish an agency not only to obtain news but also to inform the Anatolian people about the current situation as well as the world public opinion. Mustafa Kemal Pasha also looked for such an organization in order to announce the national case to the world public and to prompt the people to join in the National movement as well.¹⁴⁷

The idea of the founding AA firstly came from Halide Edip (Adıvar) and Yunus Nadi (Abalıoğlu). Halide Edip proposed different names, such as Turkish Agency, Ankara Agency, and Anatolian Agency. Yunus Nadi chose the name of Anatolian

¹⁴⁶ İnuğur, *Ibid.*, p. 361; Topuz, *II. Mahmut'tan Holdinglere...*, p. 138; Yalçın, *Ibid.*, pp. 181-189.

¹⁴⁷ Turgut Er, *Türkiye'de Basın Yayın ve Tanıtma*, (Ankara: Ümit Yayıncılık ve Matbaacılık, 2003), p. 40-41; Öztoprak, *Ibid.*, p. 20.

Agency.¹⁴⁸ Then, they offered the idea of AA to Mustafa Kemal Pasha and he also approved this agency.¹⁴⁹ After the decisions taken, AA was established on April 6, 1920.¹⁵⁰ Mustafa Kemal Pasha introduced AA to the country and declared the establishment of the organization with a manifesto, dated April 8, 1920:

Being occupied of the center of the Ottoman Sultanate, the home of Islam, by the enemy, as a result of encountering the greatest danger of the whole country and our nation, it was taken into consideration that during the national and holy struggle that the whole Rumelia and Anatolia had embarked on, the Muslim countries had to be enlightened with the right inner and outer tidings; therefore, an institution by the name of (Anatolian Agency) was established under the management of a special committee formed by the most authorized persons.

As the information and knowledge that the Anadolu Agency will provide with the fastest means will be the documented fact and the original sources of our Representative Committee and will be the result of its original sources, this agency's notifications will be distributed and announced to the streets, common spaces, even sub-districts and villages chosen by our Organization of Defense of Rights. In this respect, it is kindly requested to be taken measures and informed the result.¹⁵¹

On behalf of the Representative Committee of SDR of Anatolia and Rumelia

Mustafa Kemal

The activities of AA focused on two important purposes: The first purpose was to keep the Turkish nation awake against the provocations and incitements in and outside of the country. That is, AA tried to enlighten the people in order to provide the national unity. The second aim of AA was to give regular and true information to

¹⁴⁸ Halide Edip Adivar, *Türk'ün Ateşle İmtihani*, (İstanbul: Özgür Yayınları, 2005), p. 127.

¹⁴⁹ Yücel Özkaya, "Milli Mücadele'de Anadolu Ajansı'nın Kuruluşu ve Faaliyetlerine Ait Bazı Belgeler", *AAMD*, Vol. I, No. 2 (1985), pp. 590-591.

¹⁵⁰ Korkmaz Alemdar, *İletişim ve Tarih*, (Ankara: İmge Kitabevi, 1996), p. 58.

¹⁵¹ "Kalbigahı İslam olan merkezi Saltanat-ı Osmaniye'nin düşman işgaline geçmesi ve bütün millet ve vatanımızın en büyük tehlikeye maruz kalması neticesi olarak bütün Rumeli ve Anadolu'nun giriştiği milli ve mukaddes mücadele esnasında, efrad-ı ümmetin dahili ve harici en sahih havadis ile tenviri ihtiyac-ı mübremi nazar-ı dikkat ve ehemmiyete alınmış ve binnetice burada en selahiyattar zevattan mürekkep bir heyet-i mahsusa idaresinde ve (Anadolu Ajansı) unvanı altında bir müessese vücuda gelmiştir. Anadolu Ajansı'nın en seri vesait ile vereceği havadis ve malumat esasen Heyet-i Temsiliyemizin menabi-i asliye ve mevsukası olacağı cihetle, bu ajans tebliğatının oraca ve ezcümle müdafaa-i hukuk teşkilatımızca dahi memur ve mecma olan yerlere taliki, tab-ı teksiri ile tevziye hatta nahiye ve köylere kadar isali suretiyle mümkün olduğu kadar fazla intişar eyleyebilmesi için tertibat-ı müstacele alınması ve neticeden malumat itası ehemmiyetle rica olunur." See Atatürk'ün Tamim, Telgraf ve Beyannameleri (1917-1938), IV, (Ankara: TTK, 1991), pp. 299-300; *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, No.20, 10 Nisan 1336 [10.04.1920], p. 4.

the Turkish people about the decisions and activities of the National Forces.¹⁵² In fact, AA made great efforts to carry out these two purposes despite its poor facilities.¹⁵³ Moreover, AA provided public-government cooperation with the help of inspecting the harmful publications and informing the people about the decisions of the Assembly.¹⁵⁴

As a matter of fact, the value of news of the AA increased significantly after the Ankara Government broke off the communication with İstanbul from May 6, 1920. Now, AA was the only source of news in Anatolia and it was very important in terms of propaganda in favor of the National movement.¹⁵⁵

2.3.2. Establishment of General Directorate of Press and Intelligence (GDPI)

AA defended the legitimacy of the National movement with its publications in the country. However, the Ankara Government was in need of an intelligence organization, which would make propaganda in favor of the National movement in and outside of the country. In this regard, Deputy of Saruhan, Mustafa Necati presented a legislative proposal to the Presidency of GNA about “The General Directorate of the Press and Intelligence Directorate” on May 19, 1920. Although some members of the Assembly opposed the law proposal with the thought that this institution would lead to unnecessary expenditures, Mustafa Kemal Pasha approved the law of establishment of the GDPI. So, it was established on June 7, 1920.¹⁵⁶

Mustafa Kemal Pasha declared the establishment of the GDPI as follows:

According to a generally accepted fact, one of the most important reasons for the disasters that our country is facing is the neglect of domestic and foreign publicity in the proper management of the nation's high interests. The fact that the organization of politics and thought had long been neglected, as effective as

¹⁵² Tevfik Işık, “Anadolu Ajansı ve Türk Medyasına Katkısı (Yazılı Basın 2005 Yılı Değerlendirmesi)”, (U.M.T.), (Kayseri: Erciyes Üniversitesi, 2006), pp. 23-24.

¹⁵³ Oral, *Ibid.*, p. 48.

¹⁵⁴ Özkaya, “Milli Mücadele’de Anadolu Ajansı’nın Kuruluşu...”, p. 592; Topuz, *100 Soruda Türk Basın...*, p. 133; Er, *Ibid.*, p. 41.

¹⁵⁵ Işık, *Ibid.*, p. 23.

¹⁵⁶ İskit, *Türkiye’de Matbuat İdareleri...*, pp. 218-220; *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, No.31, 20 Mayıs 1336 [20.05.1920], pp. 2-3.

weapons in advocating our national interests, had caused many disasters and has already led many evils. Through the establishment of a strong organization, these days, when the power of thought is superior to all forces, it is aimed to fulfill two great purposes such as defending our national politics against the outside and spreading it everywhere. The General Directorate of Publishing and Intelligence, which is envisaged to be established by the draft law, should try to realize two big aims.¹⁵⁷

With this organization, the Ankara Government could get the newspapers under its control and could follow the developments in the world by constantly watching the world press and agencies. Furthermore, AA was directly linked to the GDPI. The translations and information, gathered by AA, were also used for intelligence. That is, the GDPI successfully carried out the intelligence services, which were necessary for the security of the state, in addition to the press services.¹⁵⁸

The GDPI opened many intelligence branches in different cities, such as İstanbul, Zonguldak, Trabzon, İnebolu, Aydın, Antalya, Kars, Adana and İzmit, and spread all news provided from these places all parts of the country, even the smallest settlement units.¹⁵⁹ In addition to the branches in the country, the GDPI also opened representative agencies in major European centers, such as London, Paris, Berlin, Vienna, Geneva and New York. These representatives published bulletins at various times of the day and sent them to various centers via telegrams. These representatives also printed books and brochures to explain the purpose of the Anatolian resistance movement and justify the legitimacy of the movement.¹⁶⁰

2.4. The Significance of the Press for Mustafa Kemal Pasha

The most important thing that keeps a government in power is to create public opinion in favor of itself. In other words, informing and directing people on the side of the power enables it to strengthen its authority. In that sense, the most important

¹⁵⁷ Belkıs Ulusoy, "Milli Mücadele, Propaganda, Atatürk ve Basın", *İstanbul Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Dergisi*, No. 20 (2004), pp. 60-61.

¹⁵⁸ For more detailed information on Intelligence services of the General Directorate of Press and Intelligence, See Hikmet Zeki Kapıcı, "Matbuat ve İstihbarat Umum Müdürlüğü'nün İstihbarat Çalışmaları Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme", *The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies*, No. 33 (2015), pp. 261-278.

¹⁵⁹ Öztoprak, *Ibid.*, p. 22-23; Alemdar, *İletişim ve Tarih*, pp. 65-66.

¹⁶⁰ Alemdar, *İletişim ve Tarih*, p. 66.

means of connecting people to the state and directing society to the certain target is the mass media. For example, Napoleon, who first sensed and used the power of the press for informing, influencing and guiding, said in a statement that: ‘‘To be fair is not enough to be good. Those who are ruled must believe in the rulers. The basis of the power is the public opinion. What is a government? If the government has lost the public opinion, nothing!’’¹⁶¹ Indeed, a government can gain the faith and trust of its people by taking public opinion under control via the media organs.

Mustafa Kemal Pasha, who was aware of the influential force of the press on the people, also gave big importance to the press. He even printed a daily newspaper called *Minber* with his friend Fethi (Okyar) on November 2, 1918, in the Armistice. Mustafa Kemal Pasha published editorials in this newspaper with the nickname *Minber*. *Minber* was a clear example that Mustafa Kemal gave the importance to the press even before the National Struggle emerged.¹⁶²

Furthermore, Mustafa Kemal Pasha delivered a speech on March 1, 1922, in GNA and explained the role of the press in creating the public opinions:

Nations have to introduce their public opinion to the world. Learning the whole world public is undoubtedly necessary for the regulation of the life. In this regard, the first and most important available tool is the press. The press is the public voice of the nation. The press itself is a force, a school, a leader in enlightenment and guidance of a nation, in meeting the need of a nation for thought and in short, in enabling the common direction of a nation to walk to happiness...¹⁶³

As it is known that the most influential media in the formation of public opinion was newspapers during the period of National Struggle since there were no other alternatives, such as radio and television. Mustafa Kemal Pasha, who had realized the power and effect of the press to create public opinion, always took advantage of the press to provide support on the side of the National movement. For example, Mustafa Kemal Pasha led to establishing *İrade-i Milliye* in Sivas and *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* in Ankara in order to mobilize the people to support the National Resistance movement. It is evident that Mustafa Kemal Pasha attached importance to the press and used it as an alternative weapon to prevent all harmful propaganda and publications of

¹⁶¹ Er, *Ibid.*, 37.

¹⁶² Önder, ‘‘Milli Mücadele’nin Gazetesi Hakimiyet-i Milliye...’’, p. 286.

¹⁶³ Sami N. Özerdim, *Atatürkçünün El Kitabı*, (Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları, 1981), p. 175.

rebels and minorities, causing to mislead the people. Especially, after the opening of the GNA, the newspapers became the most powerful forces to integrate the nation to the Assembly. As a matter of fact, the press played a crucial role in explaining the activities, the rights and aims of the nation to the Turkish public opinion and in announcing the decisions of the Assembly to the outside world. There is no doubt that the newspapers prepared the ground for being main power throughout the Anatolia.¹⁶⁴

In addition to these, Mustafa Kemal Pasha tried to use effectively the press on the way to salvation. Therefore, he decided to establish the connection with the Association of İstanbul Press (İstanbul Matbuat Cemiyeti). Mustafa Kemal sent a telegraph, expressing the integrity of the homeland and the nation was in danger, and he asked for the help of newspapers published in İstanbul to enlighten and give information to the people about the current situation.¹⁶⁵

Moreover, Mustafa Kemal Pasha sent a telegram to the Province of Sivas and Committee Center (Heyet-i Merkeziye) on March 4, 1920, and he explained the important points, which the national press should have taken into consideration. In the telegram, Mustafa Kemal Pasha repeatedly warned nationalist newspapers and demanded them to avoid making mistakes that would damage the interests of Turkey. He also asked the nationalist press to keep away from harmful publications against European public opinion. Moreover, Mustafa Kemal Pasha kindly requested patriotic journalists to write articles, which took attention of the European public opinion on the legitimacy of the Turkish National Struggle. He expressed that the press should be respectful rights and the law of the European nations.¹⁶⁶

During the period of National Struggle, some of İstanbul newspapers, *Peyam-ı Sabah*, *Alemdar* published harmful broadcasts against the National Struggle and these newspapers tried to dissuade people from giving support to the National Forces. Mustafa Kemal began to take some measures against these newspapers. He sent a telegram from Ankara to the army corps, some provinces and lieutenant

¹⁶⁴ Özkaya, *Milli Mücadele'de Atatürk ve Basın*, p. 27.

¹⁶⁵ Özkaya, "Milli Mücadele Başlangıcında Basın...", p. 885.

¹⁶⁶ Atatürk'ün Tamim, Telgraf ve Beyannameleri, p. 251-252.

governors on March 23, 1920. In his telegram, he ordered that such İstanbul newspapers as *Peyam-ı Sabah*, *Alemdar* and the Greek and Armenian newspapers should not get into Anatolia. In addition to this, Mustafa Kemal ordered the army corps to be pulled immediately the newspapers, which had previously entered Anatolia, from the market.¹⁶⁷

In the forthcoming days, some members of the nationalist press in İstanbul, who supported the National Resistance movement, escaped from İstanbul and came to Ankara. Among these journalists, there were Ahmet Emin (Yalman), Rusen Eşref (who had previously come to Sivas), Yunus Nadi (Abalıoğlu), and Celal Nuri (İleri). Mustafa Kemal, on March 26, 1920, informed the Commander of the 15th Army Corps that he had provided the necessary road conditions for the journalists to come to Ankara, but that they faced financial difficulties.¹⁶⁸

In addition to local journalists, Mustafa Kemal Pasha even helped some foreign journalists and writers to come to Anatolia in order to let them see closely the current situation. They were also encouraged to create an atmosphere in favor of the National movement in the western press. In that way, Mustafa Kemal Pasha aimed to prevent the foreign press taking a negative attitude against the Turkish people and to pull the attention of the outside world on the National Struggle.¹⁶⁹ For example, during the days of Sivas Congress (September 4-11, 1919), Mustafa Kemal Pasha, at the recommendation of Halide Edip, met with Louis E. Browne, who was the reporter of *American Daily News*. Mustafa Kemal asked him to be sent a delegation from the American Congress to examine Turkey and to prepare a report on the real situation.¹⁷⁰

¹⁶⁷ Özkaya, *Milli Mücadele'de Atatürk ve Basın*, pp. 29-31.

¹⁶⁸ Atatürk'ün Tamim, Telgraf ve Beyannameleri, p. 286.

¹⁶⁹ Baykal, *Ibid.*, p. 479.

¹⁷⁰ Özkaya, "Milli Mücadele Başlangıcında Basın...", p. 881.

CHAPTER 3

RELIGIOUS AND LEGAL ASPECTS OF LEGITIMACY OF TURKISH NATIONAL STRUGGLE

3.1. Emergence of the National Struggle and The Attitude of İstanbul Governments Towards Developments in Anatolia

3.1.1. İstanbul Governments in the Armistice and the National Struggle

The Government of the CUP, which determined the fate of the Ottoman Empire for a decade (1908-1918), dragged the empire into the war by the end of November in 1914 and brought the empire to the edge of collapse with its wrong war strategies and practices. When the CUP had noticed that the defeat of the empire became unavoidable, Grand Vizier Talat Pasha offered his resignation to the Sultan Vahdettin (1918-1922) on October 8, 1918.¹⁷¹ On this occasion, the Sultan firstly gave the duty of forming the cabinet to Tefvik Pasha but he could not establish a cabinet.¹⁷² Instead of him, Ahmet İzzet Pasha established the government on October

¹⁷¹ *Vakit*, No.344, 8 Teşrin-i Evvel 1334 [08.10.1918], p. 1; *Yeni Gün*, No.35, 9 Teşrin-i Evvel 1334 [09.10.1918], p. 1. After the overthrow of the CUP, Enver, Talat and Cemal Pasha, who were three important members of the CUP, fled across the Black Sea in a German warship in the night of November 1-2, 1918. Before leaving İstanbul, they sent a letter to Ahmet İzzet Pasha. In this letter, they said: "We did not intend to escape. However, when the fleet of the Allies arrived İstanbul, we did not want to be there. We will respond to the slanders, which were said and would be said behind of us. When the time become available, we will come back to the country and reply all slanders in the presence of the nation." Ahmet İzzet (Furgaç) Pasha, *Feryadım*, Vol. II, Prep. By Süheyl İzzet Fugaç and Yüksel Kanar, (İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları, 2017), pp. 287-288.

¹⁷² Talat Pasha and Sultan Vahdettin had met on October 4, 1918 in the palace and Talat Pasha said that he would withdraw from the power. The Sultan accepted his resignation; however, the Sultan asked him to keep his resignation hidden until the new cabinet would be formed. In the meeting, Talat Pasha also asked from the Sultan that the some unionists, like Cavit Bey, Hayri Efendi, and Rahmi Bey should have included in the new cabinet. Talat Pasha thought that only these unionist members could prevent the political and economic disasters in the country and he could convince the Sultan his thoughts. Although the Sultan insisted to be assigned these unionists, Tefvik Pasha did not accept to add them in the list of his cabinet. That's why he gave up forming the new cabinet. Necati Çavdar, *Son Osmanlı Sadrazamı Ahmet Tefvik Paşa*, (Ankara: Berikan Yayınevi, 2016), pp. 274-277.

14, 1918. The immediate task of İzzet Pasha was to seek an Armistice which became a general desire of the people.¹⁷³ As for the structure of İzzet Pasha cabinet, there were some unionist members. Foreexample, the former Shaikh al-İslam Hayri Efendi became the Minister of Justice, the former Minister of Finance Cavid Bey stayed in his place, and the former Ambassador of Ottoman Empire in Bulgaria (1913-1917) and deputy of İstanbul in the CUP Ali Fethi (Okyar) Bey became the Minister of Internal Affairs.¹⁷⁴ For this reason, İzzet Pasha cabinet was described as the “aftereffect cabinet” (artçı kabine) in the press of the period.¹⁷⁵ Infact, Ahmet İzzet Pasha played a transitional role between the unionist cabinets and non-unionists. He had opposed the war; he was a man of moderate but patriotic political views. Furthermore, İzzet Pasha tried to give the impression that his cabinet rejected the partisanship and followed integrative and conciliatory politics, and also supported nationalism. In that way, he tried to preserve the remaining lands after the First World War.¹⁷⁶

At the very beginning, the cabinet of İzzet Pasha, which came into power in very hard times, was considered as a “moderate the CUP Government” in the public. Therefore, in the forthcoming days, the cabinet started to be criticized severely by anti-unionist political groups. They claimed that as long as some of the unionists stayed in the cabinet, İzzet Pasha could not be successful to get rid of unionism.¹⁷⁷ Furthermore, various media organs, like *Akşam*, *Vakit*, *Sabah*, *Hadisat*, and *Minber*, began to conduct a negative campaign against İzzet Pasha cabinet. All these newspapers asked from the cabinet to purge unionist officials.¹⁷⁸ Especially, Ali Kemal, who was the editor of *Sabah* at that time, warned the government sternly: “What are Hayri and even Cavid doing in the cabinet of İzzet Pasha, who had come to power with the aim of repairing the terrible and evil mistakes of the former power,

¹⁷³ Metin Ayışığı, *Mareşal Ahmet İzzet Paşa (Askeri ve Siyasi Hayatı)*, (Ankara: TTK, 2013), p. 189.

¹⁷⁴ İbnülemin Mahmud Kemal İnal, *Osmanlı Devrinde Son Sadrazamlar*, Vol. XIII, (İstanbul: TİBKY, 2012), p. 1980; Ahmet İzzet Pasha, *Ibid.*, pp. 20-22.

¹⁷⁵ *Vakit*, No.351, 15 Teşrin-i Evvel 1334 [15.10.1918], p. 1.

¹⁷⁶ Ayışığı, *Ibid.*, p. 193.

¹⁷⁷ Ayışığı, *Ibid.*, pp. 195-197.

¹⁷⁸ Ahmet İzzet Pasha, *Ibid.*, p. 30.

or the CUP? The only thing that they should do is to go aside, like their old friends.’’¹⁷⁹

The growing critics and pressure of anti-unionist groups and press put Ahmet İzzet Pasha in very difficult situation. Also, İzzet Pasha failed to meet the demands of the opposition, which not only wanted to be punished the war criminals but also wanted to be removed immediately the unionist ministers in the cabinet. On the other hand, İzzet Pasha tried to prevent the occupation attempts made by the Allied Powers in the south. Eventually, Ahmet İzzet Pasha, who could stay in power for twenty-five days, had to offer his resignation on November 8, 1918.¹⁸⁰

Three days after the resignation of Ahmet İzzet Pasha, the Sultan Vahdettin entrusted Ahmet Tevfik Pasha with the formation of a new cabinet on November 11, 1918.¹⁸¹ He was closer to the Sultan Vahdettin and the British policy, and distant to unionists. The Sultan aimed to make two strategic attempts in terms of foreign and internal policy by assigning Tevfik Pasah as Grand Vizier. Firstly, Sultan Vahdettin sought to conduct moderate foreign policy and reconcile with the Allied powers, - as a matter of fact - with Britain. Secondly, the Sultan wanted to strengthen his own authority by getting rid of unionists and purifying the executive power from political network of unionists.¹⁸²

In fact, Tevfik Pasha established a neutral government; that is, the new cabinet was based on neither the unionist, nor the Freedom and Accord Party, which was the opposition of the CUP. In this regard, Tevfik Pasha cabinet can be described totally

¹⁷⁹ *Sabah*, No.10391, 23 Teşrin-i Evvel 1334 [23.10.1918], p. 1.

¹⁸⁰ *Vakit*, No.377, 10 Teşrin-i Sani 1334 [10.11.1918], p. 1; *Tasvir-i Efkar*, No.2557, 11 Teşrin-i Sani 1334 [11.11.1918], p. 1; Ahmet İzzet Pasha, *Ibid.*, pp. 40- 47.

¹⁸¹ *TV*, No.3392, 11 Teşrin-i Sani 1334 [11.11.1918], p. 1; *Vakit*, No.379, 12 Teşrin-i Sani 1334 [12.11.1918], p. 1.

¹⁸² The fact that Tevfik Pasha had been the last London Ambassador of the Ottoman Empire played an important role in forming of the new cabinet. Indeed, the Sultan wanted to assign a Grand Vizier who knew the British statesmen and followed the British policy very well. According to another view, the Sultan preferred for Tevfik Pasha as Grand Vizier because he decided to eliminate unionist formation in the structure of the state. In addition to these, Tevfik Pasha was the father-in-law of Sultan Vahdettin. The eldest son of Tevfik Pasha, İsmail Hakkı (Okday) Bey was married to Fatma Ulviye Sultan, daughter of Vahdettin. After the period of the CUP had ended, Vahdettin chose Tevfik Pasha as his political friend and a confidant. They believed in each other. This mutual belief continued until the bankruptcy of their policies and the collapse of the Ottoman Sultanate. Çavdar, *Son Osmanlı Sadrazamı...*, pp. 274-275.

as “the cabinet of the Sultan”, like the governments established in the period of Sultan Abdulhamid II (1876-1908).¹⁸³ The new cabinet made a great effort to establish friendly relations with the Allies and eliminate the unionists from executive power. Meanwhile, as the Sultan desired, the press also expected from the government to put an end the influence of unionists in the administration. For example, *Sabah* published the following statement under the title of “Our Expectation from the New Government” and called the government for the dissolution of unionism: “First of all, it is necessary to save this miserable homeland from the gang called Union and Progress and from the expelled spirit of it. This gang was not scattered by some of its ringleaders, who went abroad. It seems that it was not abolished. This gang would recover itself by the time after it had rided out the storm. It would reappear as soon as possible.”¹⁸⁴

Tevfik Pasha could not take enough support expected from the press and people and he was exposed to the heavy criticisms of the newspapers. Therefore, in spite of receiving vote of confidence from the Ottoman Parliament (Meclis-i Mebusan), composed of a majority of the unionists, on November 19, 1918, Tevfik Pasha had to resign his post as Grand Vizier on January 12, 1919.¹⁸⁵

In spite of all criticisms, the Sultan Vahdettin assigned again Tevfik Pasha to form the cabinet and he established his second cabinet the next day by making some changes in first cabinet.¹⁸⁶ The new government was, in a sense, a continuation of the first one. The reason for being re-assigned of Tevfik Pasha as the Grand Vizier was to solve the issue of “peace” as soon as possible by taking advantage of his international experience. Unlike Ahmet İzzet Pasha, Tevfik Pasha was an experienced diplomat, who worked in Rome, Vienna, Berlin, London and Sen-Petersburg. In this regard, the Sultan had an expectation to provide the order and conclude the peace by using influence of Tevfik Pasha in and outside of the

¹⁸³ Sina Akşin, *İstanbul Hükümetleri ve Milli Mücadele*, Vol. I, (İstanbul: TİBKY, 2004), pp. 79-80.

¹⁸⁴ *Sabah*, No.10410, 11 Teşrin-i Sani 1334 [11.11.1918], p. 1.

¹⁸⁵ *Yeni Gün*, No.131, 13 Kanun-i Sani 1335 [13.01.1919], p 1; *Alemdar*, No.31-1341, 14 Kanun-i Sani 1335 [14.01.1919], p. 1.

¹⁸⁶ *TV*, No.3445 13 Kanun-i Sani 1335 [13.01.1919], p. 1; *Yeni Gün*, No.131, 13 Kanun-i Sani 1335 [13.01.1919], p 1; *İkdam*, No.7876, 14 Kanun-i Sani 1335 [14.01.1919], p. 1.

country.¹⁸⁷ The public was also impatient and looked forward to be made peace as soon as possible because the governmental crises in İstanbul created political turmoil and it began to prevail over the country. Always, some ministers were resigning and new ministers were assigned. From the beginning of February, the newspapers began to incite the governmental crisis with their publications. For instance, *İleri (Ati)* criticized Grand Vizier Tevfik Pasha by writing that “the government you presided does not represent any national part, no party, no public element, including oppositions or proponents.”¹⁸⁸

Moreover, the fact that being organized of Freedom and Accord Party and appeared in the political arena after the Armistice was another development, which undermined the activities of the Tevfik Pasha cabinet.¹⁸⁹ The Freedom and Accord Party planned to come to power based on the British and the Sultan after the unionists were suppressed. That’s why, the Party made very severe propaganda against Tevfik Pasha. The main focus of hard politics of Freedom and Accord Party was based on the claim that the government could not act hard enough against the unionist, which both the Britain and the Sultan expected.¹⁹⁰ Further, it was believed that Tevfik Pasha's prudent policy would not yield any results. The solution was to form a government that could make more dynamic and extraordinary attempts.¹⁹¹ Ultimately, the second Tevfik Pasha cabinet withdrew from the Power on March 3, 1919, by not standing much more against the pressure.¹⁹²

¹⁸⁷ Orhan Koloğlu, *Son Sadrazam: Milli Mücadele Taraftarı Ahmed Tevfik Paşa*, (İstanbul: Doğan Egmont Yayıncılık, 2007), pp. 9, 99.

¹⁸⁸ *İleri*, No.393, 10 Şubat 1335 [10.02.1919], p. 1. For similar more news, See *Alemdar*, No.59-1369, 17 Şubat 1335 [17.02.1919], p. 1; *Ibid.*, No.60-1370, 18 Şubat 1335 [18.02.1919], p. 1; *Ibid.*, No.61-1371, 19 Şubat 1335 [19.02.1919], p. 1; *İkdam*, No.7915, 22 Şubat 1335 [22.02.1919], p. 1.

¹⁸⁹ For the organization of Freedom and Accord Party in this period, See Tarık Zafer Tunaya, *Türkiye’de Siyasal Partiler*, Vol. II, *Mütareke Dönemi, 1918-1922*, (İstanbul: Hürriyet Vakfı Yayınları, 1986), pp. 264-307.

¹⁹⁰ Çavdar, *Son Osmanlı Sadrazamı...* pp. 228-229.

¹⁹¹ Koloğlu, *Ibid.*, p. 100. Ali Fuat Türkgeldi, in his memoirs, explained how a government should be formed in those days: “Tevfik Pasha was personally a respectable person in terms of his honor and behavior. But his cabinet, in general, was weak and deprived of the might to win over the event, which overlap in the face of the extraordinary of the situation. At such a time, there was a need for a cabinet that would endeavor to preserve the national interests and unity of the country by avoiding personal emotions and various political currents. Tevfik Pasha tried to destroy this deficiency of his cabinet with constant changes, but he could not make right choices and he even came to a dedlock”. See Ali Fuat Türkgeldi, *Görüp İşittiklerim*, (Ankara: TTK, 1951), p. 166.

¹⁹² *Alemdar*, No.74-1384, 4 Mart 1335 [04.03.1919], p. 1; *Vakit*, No.490, 4 Mart 1335 [04.03.1919], p. 1.

The next day after the withdrawal of Tevfik Pasha from the power, a new government, composing of members of Freedom and Accord Party, was formed by Grand Vizier Damat Ferid Pasha, who was brother-in-law of Sultan Vahdettin, on March 4, 1919.¹⁹³ From this date on, Damat Ferid came to the power many times and went.¹⁹⁴ So, the transition period was left behind with his cabinets.

The occupation of İzmir occurred during the period of the first Damat Ferid Pasha cabinet. As will be seen in detail, Damat Ferid did not took even the slightest measures against the danger of occupation; conversely, he facilitated the occupation by removing patriotic commanders like Nurettin Pasha, who could resist against the occupation of the city.¹⁹⁵ The occupation of İzmir had caused to emergence of a great spiritual revolt against both the Allies and Greeks in the eyes of Turkish people and all nations influentially protested the Allies. Additionally, the occupation of İzmir provided the Turkish nation called ‘war tiredness’ with very dynamic power. In other words, İzmir incident enabled patriotic Turkish people to awake from unresponsiveness and mobilized them to take necessary measures against further expansion of the occupation.¹⁹⁶ The first Damat Ferid Pasha cabinet was also affected by these public demonstrations and had to resign his post on May 16, 1919.¹⁹⁷

In spite of Damat Ferid Pasha’s unsuccessful policies, the Sultan reassigned him to form the government; thus, he established his second cabinet on May 19, 1919, by

¹⁹³ TV, No.3488, 4 Mart 1335 [04.03.1919], p. 1. Damad Ferid was born in 1853. He get got married to Mediha Sultan, who was elder sister of Sultan Vahdettin, while he carried out the duty of the “head clerk” at the London Embassy. Damat Ferid took the title of “Pasha” and he was appointed as a member of the Council of State. He was also elected as a member of the Senate (Meclis-i Ayan). In 1911, he joined among the founders of Freedom and Accord Party and opposed the Unionists. After the Armistice, he entered the Ottoman Salvation Party (Selamet-i Osmaniye Fırkası). See Feridun Ergin, “Mütareke Kabineleri”, *AAMD*, Vol. VII, No. 21 (1991), p. 398.

¹⁹⁴ The people had been not happy since Vahdettin’s ascending to the throne. Disasters followed each other. He noticed that he could not become a popular sultan. He was afraid of losing his throne. He needed a Grand Vizier to practice his orders, not to break away from loyalty, to endure the pressures of Allied Powers, and to get rid of dissatisfactions. Therefore, he chose Damat Ferit Pasha. Ergin, *Ibid.*, p. 398.

¹⁹⁵ Akşin, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 261.

¹⁹⁶ Koloğlu, *Ibid.*, p. 105.

¹⁹⁷ Melek Öksüz, “Amerikan Belgelerine Göre I. Dünya Savaşı ve Mütareke Dönemlerinde Osmanlı Hükümetleri”, *Turkish Studies, (International Periodical For the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic)*, Vol. V, No. 1 (2010), p. 1264; *Vakit*, No.558, 17 Mayıs 1335 [17.05.1919], p. 1.

dismissing seven ministers of the nine members of the cabinet.¹⁹⁸ Damat Ferid also took over the Ministry of Foreign Affairs as it was in the previous government. The most important change in the cabinet was to be assigned of Ali Kemal¹⁹⁹ as the Minister of Interior, instead of Cemal Bey. Moreover, Şevket Turgut Pasha became new Minister of War.²⁰⁰ During the period of his second cabinet, Damat Ferid challenged with two major issues: The first one was to conduct peace negotiations with Allied powers. Therefore, Damat Ferid went to Paris to explain the arguments of the government at the Paris Peace Conference on June 6, 1919.²⁰¹ The second issue was the National Forces, which emerged in the Aegean after the occupation of İzmir, and the activities of Mustafa Kemal in Anatolia.²⁰² After a while, Damat Ferid Pasha started to be criticized by an opposition group in the Freedom and Accord Party. Also, his supporters in the party started to react against the policies of Damat Ferid. Even Tevfik Pasha complained about the policy of Damat Ferid and he expressed his dissatisfaction to the Sultan: “The situation is so serious, everyone hates the Government and Ferid Pasha, I have no ambition, I express these just because of my

¹⁹⁸ TV, No.3553, 19 Mayıs 1335 [19.05.1919], p. 1; *Alemdar*, No.148-1458, 20 Mayıs 1335 [20.05.1919], p. 1. In this regard, Damat Ferid said that *it is not right to leave the Sultan alone at such a time; we should endure until the end; If it is not possible for us to continue, then we will retreat, not to come again*. Türkgeldi, *Görüp İştiklerim*, p. 210.

¹⁹⁹ Ali Kemal was owner of *Peyam*. *Peyam* and *Sabah*, published by Mihran (Nakkaşoğlu), were combined at the beginning of 1920 and Ali Kemal became editor of *Peyam-ı Sabah*. For more detail information, See Footnote 85.

²⁰⁰ Öksüz, *Ibid.*, p. 1264.

²⁰¹ *İkdam*, No.8020, 7 Haziran 1335 [07.06.1919], p. 1; *Tasvir-i Efkâr*, No.2748, 7 Haziran 1335 [07.06.1919], p. 1. Damat Ferid reminded the conference that the Ottoman nation had no responsibility for entering the war and that all responsibility belonged to the CUP and German Empire. He also asked that the Ottoman lands of 1914 should be protected. In the response of Allied powers, all of the arguments alleged by Damat Ferid were rejected. Ali Türkgeldi, *Moudros ve Mudanya Mütarekelerinin Tarihi*, (Ankara: Türk Devrim Tarihi Enstitüsü Yayınları, 1948), pp. 116-118; Öztoprak, *Ibid.*, pp. 31-34. For the whole proclamations of Damat Ferid, See *İfham*, No.84, 25 Teşrin-i Evvel 1335 [25.10.1919], p. 1. After Damat Ferid advocated the arguments of his government at the Conference, Clemenceau expelled him with insulting expressions from the Peace Conference. So, he return to İstanbul on July 15, 1919. Türkgeldi, *Moudros ve Mudanya ...* p. 118. For the text of the responses of Clemenceau on behalf of the Conference, See Galip Kemali Söylemezoğlu, *Yok Edilmek İstenen Millet*, (İstanbul: Selek Neşriyat, 1957), pp. 86-90. For the news about Paris Peace Conference and the failure of Damat Ferid in the Conference, See *İkdam*, No.8054, 11 Temmuz 1335 [11.07.1919], p. 1; *Vakit*, No.611, 11 Temmuz 1335 [11.07.1919], p. 1.

²⁰² Koloğlu, *Ibid.*, pp. 107-108.

loyalty.’’²⁰³ Therefore, Damat Ferid decided to dissolve his cabinet on July 20, 1919.²⁰⁴

A day later, Damat Ferid set up his third cabinet²⁰⁵ and began to deal with the decisions of Erzurum and Sivas Congress and the leaders of National movement in Anatolia. Since he encouraged and equipped Ali Galip, Governor of Elazığ, to raid the Sivas Congress, SDR of Anatolia and Rumelia immediately cut off the official communication between Anatolia and İstanbul on September 12, 1919, and issued a declaration that described Ferid Pasha as the traitor.²⁰⁶ With successful progress and spread of the National movement in Anatolia, the İstanbul Government came to position that it was now unable to rule and implement its laws in Anatolia. That is, the İstanbul Government lost its authorities on civil and military institutions in Anatolia. For this reason, Damat Ferid could not maintain his mission much more and had to withdraw from the power on October 1, 1919.²⁰⁷

After the fall of the cabinet of Damat Ferid Pasha, Sultan Vahdettin called Tevfik Pasha and offered him to form the cabinet; however, he rejected offer of the Sultan by saying that “sadaret is not the job that I can do at that time, I should be left for next time.’’²⁰⁸ After then, Sultan Vahdettin offered Ali Rıza Pasha to form the cabinet. Even though he wanted not to accept, he consented to establish the government upon insists of Tevfik Pasha.²⁰⁹ Ultimately, Ali Rıza Pasha formed his

²⁰³ Koloğlu, *Ibid.*, p. 109.

²⁰⁴ *Alemdar*, No.118-1518, 21 Temmuz 1335 [21.07.1919], p. 1; *Tasvir-i Efkar*, No.2788, 21 Temmuz 1335 [21.07.1919], p. 1.

²⁰⁵ İhsan Güneş, *Meşrutiyet’ten Cumhuriyet’e Türkiye’de Hükümetler, Programları ve Meclisteki Yankıları (1908-1923)*, (İstanbul: TİBKY, 2012), pp. 238-239; *TV*, No.3604, 21 Temmuz 1335 [21.07.1919], p. 1.

²⁰⁶ Koloğlu, *Ibid.*, p. 111.

²⁰⁷ Öksüz, *Ibid.*, p. 1264. Ali Fuat (Cebesoy) Pasha interpreted the resignation of the third Damat Ferid cabinet as follows: *The day when the national will was manifested itself for the first time and the nation itself began to dominate its own destiny in our history of the Independence War*. Ali Fuat Cebesoy, *Milli Mücadele Hatıraları*, (İstanbul: Vatan Neşriyat, 1953), p. 229.

²⁰⁸ Nurten Çetin, *Son Sadrazam Ahmet Tevfik Paşa*, (Ankara: AAMY, 2015), p. 381; Çavdar, *Son Osmanlı Sadrazamı... p. 414*.

²⁰⁹ Çetin, *Ibid.*, p. 381. In the memoirs of Ali Fuat Türkgeldi he wrote that the Sultan said to himself about this issue: *This cabinet will be a transient cabinet! Tevfik Pasha is our ace in the hole. We must keep him for the future*. (Bu hülleci bir kabine olacak! Tevfik Paşa son fişegimizdir. Onu geleceğe saklamalıyız). See Türkgeldi, *Görüp İşittiklerim*, p. 245.

cabinet on October 2, 1919.²¹⁰ At that time, the appointment of Ali Rıza Pasha as Grand Vizier was interpreted as the first tangible political victory of the Nationalists in Anatolia. Actually, this success was partial, but influential.²¹¹

However, the Government of Ali Rıza Pasha was an “interim government.” Perhaps its most important task was to soften the movement of Mustafa Kemal and break its influence. Ali Rıza Pasha, who graduated from military collage and was old pasha, was regarded as the one who could break the severity of the National movement. The evidence for this softening policy was appeared that Mersinli Cemal Pasha was appointed as the Ministry of War. It was important appointment because Cemal Pasha was closer to the generation of Mustafa Kemal Pasha and at the same time he, as a senior one than Mustafa Kemal, could help Ali Rıza Pasha with respect to reconciliation policy.²¹² As a result of this intimacy between the İstanbul Government and the Nationalists, Ali Rıza Pasha cabinet adopted the goals of the National movement and he was supported by the Nationalists in return for this recognition. The principle of *domination of the national will* was put into practice by inauguration of the Ottoman Parliament on January 12, 1920.²¹³ Moreover, as will be seen in detail, the National Pact, which stated that portions of Ottoman Empire where the Turks were in a majority should remain under Turkish rule, was adopted in the Ottoman Parliament during Ali Rıza Pasha’ Grand Vizirate.²¹⁴

The relations based on mutual confidence between İstanbul and Ankara could last a short time because the moderate and reconciliatory policy of Ali Rıza Pasha cabinet towards the National movement brought with the British intervention. Lord Curzon, the British Minister of Foreign Affairs, accused the Ottoman government of violating the spirit of the Armistice. Therefore, the British High Commissioner in İstanbul also sent a memorandum to the Government, ordering that Minister of War Cemal Pasha and Chief of General Staff Cevat Pasha had to resign their posts in the cabinet. They

²¹⁰ Selçuk Duman, “Ali Rıza Paşa Hükümetinin Kuruluşu”, Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, Vol. 12, No. 2 (2002), pp. 341-358; TV, No. 3662, 2 Teşrin-i Evvel 1335 [02.10.1919], p. 1; *İrade-i Milliye*, No.6, 7 Teşrin-i Evvel 1335 [07.10.1919], p. 1.

²¹¹ Öksüz, *Ibid.*, p. 1264.

²¹² Akşin, *Ibid.*, vo. II, pp. 16-17.

²¹³ Ergin, *Ibid.*, p. 400; Koloğlu, *Ibid.*, p. 111.

²¹⁴ Türkgeldi, *Moudros ve Mudanya Mütarekelerinin...* p. 123; Ergin, *Ibid.*, p. 400; *Tasvir-i Efkar*, No.2989, 16 Şubat 1336 [16.02.1920], p. 1; *Vakit*, No.819, 17 Şubat 1336 [17.02.1920], p. 1.

planned the elimination of these important pashas, who supported the Nationalists in secret ways, on the ground that they did not comply with the terms of the Armistice. The life of Ali Rıza Pasha cabinet could last for six months. Due to the military advance of Greeks in Western Anatolia and the pressure of the Allies for condemnation of the Nationalists, Ali Rıza Pasha had to relinquish the power on March 3, 1920.²¹⁵

After withdrawal of Ali Rıza Pasha, the Sultan entrusted Salih Hulusi Pasha to form a new cabinet and he established his cabinet on March 8, 1920.²¹⁶ The next day, Vahdettin called Salih Pasha and warned him about not receiving any deputy from Assembly to his cabinet. Although Salih Pasha dissatisfied with this intervention, he remained loyal to the order of the Sultan and did not appoint any deputy to his cabinet. Moreover, Salih Pasha cabinet was regarded as a “rambling government” since the cabinet was “hastily” formed. Accordingly, Salih Pasha was aware that such a government, which was established at a time when internal and external relations were strained, could not continue.²¹⁷ The fear of Salih Pasha came true: The official Allied occupation of İstanbul on March 16, 1920 became the catastrophic disaster for Salih Pasha cabinet and even the whole nation. On this occasion, the Nationalists in Ankara cut off all official communication and relation with the İstanbul Government. The English arrested some members of the Ottoman Parliament and exiled them to Malta.²¹⁸ Furthermore, the deputies suspended their sessions until they could work safely. Ultimately, Salih Pasha had to submit his resignation on April 2, 1920.²¹⁹

After Salih Pasha withdrew from the power, Sultan Vahdettin allowed again Damat Ferid Pasha to form new cabinet. Damat Ferid established his fourth cabinet on April

²¹⁵ Akşin, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 447; *İleri*, No.774, 4 Mart 1336 [04.03.1920], p. 1; *Peyam-ı Sabah*, No.63, 4 Mart 1336 [04.03.1920], p. 1.

²¹⁶ *TV*, No.3796, 9 Mart 1336 [09.03.1920], p. 1; *Vakit*, No.840, 9 Mart 1336 [09.03.1920], p. 1; *Peyam-ı Sabah*, No.68, 9 Mart 1336 [09.03.1920], p. 1; Güneş, *Ibid.*, pp. 252-253.

²¹⁷ Akşin, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 463-464.

²¹⁸ Cebesoy, *Ibid.*, p. 313; Koloğlu, *Ibid.*, pp. 114-115.

²¹⁹ *Alemdar*, No.473-2773, 4 Nisan 1336 [04.04.1920], p. 1; *Yeni Gün*, No.372, 4 Nisan 1336 [04.04.1920], p. 1; *Peyam-ı Sabah*, No.94, 4 Nisan 1336 [04.04.1920], p. 1; Akşin, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 577.

5, 1920.²²⁰ Meanwhile, Hüseyin Kazım (Kadri), who was vice president of the Ottoman Parliament, met with the Sultan in the palace and emphasized that the coming of Damat Ferid to power would be a disaster for the country. However, the Sultan was so annoyed him by saying that “if I desire, I would put the Patriarch of the Greek or the Patriarch of the Armenian, and even the Chief Rabbi into power.”²²¹ So, the Sultan insisted on the cabinet of Damad Ferid.

The important developments related to the relations of İstanbul and Ankara happened during the period of the fourth Damat Ferid Pasha cabinet. Firstly, Damat Ferid ordered Shayk-al Islam Dürrizade Abdullah Efendi to issue a fatwa against the Nationalists and National movement. This fatwa announced that it was a holy duty for all Muslims to kill the Nationalists, who carried out the Anatolian movement.²²² Even though the İstanbul Government, namely Damat Ferid, posed religious and military obstacles, the Nationalists opened the GNA in Ankara and established a “Provisional Government” on May 2, 1920. The Government of Damat Ferid Pasha did not recognize the legitimacy of the GNA and sentenced Mustafa Kemal and other Nationalists to death in Court Martial in İstanbul.²²³ In return for this, the GNA also published a declaration emphasizing that Damat Ferid and anti-nationalist members in his cabinet were traitors and had to be removed from citizenship.²²⁴ Also, in an article published in *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, it was argued that “Damat Ferit was not beneficial to this country and would be harmful.”²²⁵ The rigid policies of the İstanbul Government against the Ankara Government steadily increased during this period. Damat Ferid Pasha gave instructions civil authorities to weaken the influence of the Nationalists on Anatolian people. Moreover, he did not hesitate to encourage many rebellions to undermine the authority of Ankara Government.

²²⁰ *TV*, No.3820, 5 Nisan 1336 [05.04.1920], p. 1; *Peyam-ı Sabah*, No.95, 5 Nisan 1336 [05.04.1920], p. 1; *Alemdar*, No.475-2775, 6 Nisan 1336 [06.04.1920], p. 1; *Yeni Gün*, No.374, 6 Nisan 1336 [06.04.1920], p. 1; Güneş, *Ibid.*, pp. 234-235.

²²¹ Yasemin Çelik, “Hakimiyet-i Milliye Gazetesine Göre İstanbul Hükümetleri (1920-1922)”, (U.M.T.), (Kayseri: Erciyes Üniversitesi, 2015), p. 46.

²²² *TV*, No.3824, 11 Nisan 1336 [11.04.1920], p. 1; *Alemdar*, No.480-2780, 11 Nisan 1336 [11.04.1920], p. 1; *Peyam-ı Sabah*, No. 101, 11 Nisan 1336 [11.04.1920], p. 1; Ergin, *Ibid.*, p. 403.

²²³ *TV*, No.3864, 11 Mayıs 1336 [11.05.1920], p. 1; *Alemdar*, No.510-2810, 13 Mayıs 1336 [13.05.1920], p. 2; *Peyam-ı Sabah*, No.133, 13 Mayıs 1336 [13.05.1920], p. 1.

²²⁴ Osman Akandere, “Damat Ferit Paşa’nın IV. Hükümeti Döneminde Kuvâ-yı Milliye İleri Gelenleri Hakkında Verilen İdam Kararları”, *Ankara Üniversitesi TİTE AYD*, No: 43 (2009), p. 347.

²²⁵ *Hakimiyet-i Miliye*, No.21, 13 Nisan 1336 [13.04.1920], p. 1.

The rigid policies of Damat Ferid did not produce any effect on the National movement and he offered his resignation to the Sultan on July 31, 1920, due to his failure against Ankara. However, the Sultan did not give up Damat Ferid and he entrusted again Ferid Pasha to form his fifth cabinet as Grand Vizier on August 1, 1920.²²⁶ The fifth and last cabinet of Damat Ferid was the turning point in the National Struggle because the İstanbul Government signed the Treaty of Sevres on August 10, 1920 and submitted the freedom and independence of the Turkish nation to the hand of the Allies, mainly English.²²⁷ Therefore, the people and the press harshly criticized the cabinet of Damat Ferid. The Ankara Government declared again Damat Ferid and those who signed the Sevres Treaty, as traitors. Damat Ferid no longer stays in the power. The growing criticism and pressure of the public and press resulted in the resignation of Damat Ferid on October 17, 1920.²²⁸

After the withdrawal of Damat Ferid Pasha from the power, Ahmet Tevfik Pasha was appointed as a reconciliatory Grand Vizier on October 21, 1920, with the hope of ensuring the Ankara Government to ratify the terms of the Sevres Treaty.²²⁹ However, Tevfik Pasha followed moderate policy towards the Ankara Government, and even he supported the Nationalists, who fought with enemies to protect the indivisible integrity of the state with its territory and nation. At the London Conference of January 1921, Tevfik Pasha, in a gesture of solidarity, relinquished his authority to the Nationalist delegates.²³⁰ Tevfik Pasha maintained his mission for more than two years and after the abolition of the Sultanate, he resigned on November 4, 1922. No other government was established anymore in İstanbul.

As it is seen that totally eleven governments were established in İstanbul in the course of four years. Only nine of those governments were formed between the dates of October 30, 1918, when the Mondros Armistice was signed, and April 23,

²²⁶ *TV*, No.3967, 1 Ağustos 1336 [01.08.1920], p. 1; Güneş, *Ibid.*, pp. 258-259.

²²⁷ Çelik, *Ibid.*, p. 63.

²²⁸ *Alemdar*, No.660-2960, 18 Teşrin-i Evvel 1336 [18.10.1920], p. 1; *Öğüt*, No.548, 24-25 Teşrin-i Evvel 1336 [24/25.10.1920], p. 1; Çelik, *Ibid.*, p. 67; Ergin, *Ibid.*, p. 404.

²²⁹ Çetin, *Ibid.*, p. 387; Güneş, *Ibid.*, pp. 262-263; *TV*, No. 3988, 21 Teşrin-i Sani 1336 [21.11.1920], p. 1; *Vakit*, No.1031, 22 Teşrin-i Evvel 1336 [22.10.1920], p. 1; *Hâkimiyet-i Milliye*, No.68, 25 Teşrin-i Evvel 1336 [25.10.1920], p. 1.

²³⁰ Nur Bilge Criss, *Istanbul Under Allied Occupation (1918-1923)*, (Leiden; Boston; Köln: Brill, 1999), p. XI.

1920, when the GNA was opened in Ankara. In addition, it is worth noting that all of these successive Ottoman governments during the Armistice and the National Struggle did not collaborate with the enemy. In other words, the history of İstanbul during the Armistice and the National Struggle was not solely that of the collaborationist activities of one Grand Vizier, Damat Ferid Pasha.²³¹ In this point, it was seen that the cabinet of Ahmet İzzet Pasha (October 14, 1918 - November 8, 1918) and following two cabinets of Tevfik Pasha (November 11, 1918 - January 12, 1919 and January 13, 1919 - March 4, 1919) did not prefer to pursue a policy of purge that the Allied powers expected. Although the governments of Damat Ferid Pasha used all their powers to suppress the Anatolian movement, Grand Viziers Ali Rıza Pasha (October 12, 1919 - March 3, 1920), Salih Hulusi Pasha (March 8, 1920 - April 2, 1920), and Ahmet Tevfik Pasha (October 21, 1920 - November 4, 1922) tried to reconcile with Ankara and followed a policy of covert resistance to the terms of the Armistice and to the Allied authority.²³²

3.1.2. The Mondros Armistice and the First Occupations

It can be clearly understood that İstanbul governments experienced very rapid political changes and these rapid changes caused to government crises and political instability during the Armistice and the National Struggle. In aforementioned period of political turmoil, Ahmet İzzet Pasha tried to get in touch immediately with the representatives of the Allied powers and sign an Armistice which would cease military operations. This contact was made to the British authorities on October 20, 1918, by favour of British General Sir Charles Townshend, who was the commander of abortive defence of Kut in Baghdad campaign, and had been a respected prisoner of the Turks since April 29, 1916.²³³ Then, İzzet Pasha was informed that the British Government was ready to negotiate for an Armistice, and had delegated Admiral Arthur Calthorpe for the purpose. Thus, the Armistice negotiations between the

²³¹ Criss, *Ibid.*, p. X.

²³² Sarihan, *Kurtuluş Savaşı'nda İkili...* p. 23.

²³³ Ahmet İzzet Pasha, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 27; Türkgeldi, *Görüp İşittiklerim*, p. 153.

Allies and Ottoman delegates, such as Head of Delegation, Hüseyin Rauf (Orbay),²³⁴ Undersecretary of Foreign Affairs, Reşat Hikmet, Military Advisor, Staff Lieutenant Colonel Sadullah, and Head Clerk, Ali Fuat (Türkgeldi), started in the British warship *Agamemnon* anchored at Harbor of Mondros in the Island of Lemnos on October 27, 1918.²³⁵

The İstanbul press also followed closely the process of negotiations for the Armistice. *Tasvir-i Efkar* announced “that the negotiations for armistice would begin on October 27, 1918. The newspaper gave only the names of Rauf Bey and Reşat Hikmet Bey as representatives for negotiations.”²³⁶ Also, *Vakit* reported that the negotiations were starting among the official representatives on October 26, 1918.²³⁷

The Armistice talks, which had started on October 27, 1918, lasted four days and at the end, the Mondros Armistice between the British and Ottoman governments was signed on October 30, 1918, with compliments all round, and an accompanying unofficial letter from Admiral Calthorpe, interpreting and amplifying some of its terms. *Akşam* published the conditions of the Mondros Armistice in the issue of October 31, 1918. According to the newspaper, the vital clauses of the Mondros Armistice as follows:

Demobilization of the Ottoman army apart from troops needed to police frontiers and keep internal order; the surrender of all arms and Turkish garrisons in the occupied territories to the Allies; the opening of the Dardanelles and Bosphorus; and most importantly, the ambiguous clause VII, which allowed the Allies to occupy any area if they thought there was a security threat. Another important

²³⁴ The Sultan Vahdettin informed İzzet Pasha that he wished his brother-in-law, Damat Ferid, to head the delegation. However, İzzet Pasha exclaimed that *he is almost like a madman and he has not been in public office for a long time. Also, such crucial task and vital affairs of the state cannot be entrusted to him.* But the Sultan insisted on him and said that he could keep him under discipline and give necessary instructions. İzzet Pasha replied that he must consult his cabinet. İzzet Pasha and the rest of the cabinet did not admit the proposal and the Sultan was obliged to accept the decision of the cabinet. Rauf (Orbay) Bey himself was chosen as delegate in Damat Ferid’s place with the approval of the Sultan. Ahmet İzzet Pasha, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 27-28.

²³⁵ For the detailed information about the developments happened during the Armistice talks, See Hüseyin Rauf Orbay, *Cehennem Değirmeni-Siyası Hatıralarım*, Prep. By İsmet Bozdağ, (İstanbul: Emre Yayınları, 2000), pp. 68-157.

²³⁶ *Tasvir-i Efkar*, No.2542, 27 Teşrin-i Evvel 1334 [27.10.1918], p. 1; *Yeni Gün*, No.53, 27 Teşrin-i Evvel 1334 [27.10.1918], p. 2.

²³⁷ *Vakit*, No.362, 26 Teşrin-i Evvel 1334 [26.10.1918], p. 1.

clause XIV, which enabled the Allies to occupy the six provinces in the Eastern Anatolia if they witnessed there was confusion.²³⁸

As a matter of fact, the Mondros Armistice, which was prepared unilaterally and exposed extremely heavy terms, marked the end of the First World War, as well as the end of the Ottoman Empire. With heavy terms of the Armistice, the Ottoman Empire fully surrendered itself to Allies.²³⁹ It was apparent that the destiny of the rest of the lands remained uncertain and the country was completely taken under the control of Allies. The dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire was a foregone conclusion.

While the state challenged with political turmoil in İstanbul, the Allied powers began to occupy many provinces on the Black Sea and the Mediterranean coasts. The terms of the Armistice started to be implemented arbitrarily, without ever resorting to a peace agreement.²⁴⁰ In this sense, the British soldiers in Baghdad took action to occupy Mosul, which was under the control of Ali İhsan Pasha, on November 1, 1918, after two days of signing the Armistice. Ali İhsan Pasha wanted to prevent the possible British occupation by forwarding a letter to British General Marshall in Baghdad.²⁴¹ Even though İhsan Pasha resisted the British advance for a while, the

²³⁸ *Akşam*, No.42, 31 Teşrin-i Evvel 1334 [31.10.1918], p. 1. For other journals, See *Vakit*, No.367, 31 Teşrin-i Evvel 1334 [31.10.1918], p. 1; *Hadisat*, No.15, 2 Teşrin-i Sani 1334 [02.11.1918], p. 1; *Tasvir-i Efkar*, No.2549, 3 Teşrin-i Sani 1334 [03.11.1918], p. 1. For further information, See Zekeriya Türkmen, "30 Ekim 1918 Tarihli Mondros Ateşkes Antlaşması'na Göre Türk Ordusu'nun Kuruluş ve Kadrosuna Bir Bakış", *Osmanlı Tarihi Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi Dergisi*, (OTAM), No. XI (2000), pp. 617-619.

²³⁹ The terms of the Mondros Armistice do not comply with international legal, and it also aimed to remove the existence of a state. In addition, the terms of the Armistice spontaneously became heavier because the Ottoman statesmen, who hoped help for the Wilson Principles before the signing of the cease-fire, and but could not receive what they had expected, preferred to be only spectator rather than preventing the complete destruction of the state. Afet İnan, *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti ve Türk Devrimi*, (Ankara: TTK, 1977), pp. 19-21.

²⁴⁰ İnan, *Ibid.*, p. 22.

²⁴¹ Ali İhsan Pasha sent a letter to the British General Marshall as soon as he received the information that the Armistice had been signed. In the letter dated on November 1, 1918, Ali İhsan Pasha demanded that a region, between the two belligerent armies, should be determined as a neutral zone because, at that time, the British forces were still waiting in 60 km south of Mosul. However, General Marshall ordered his troops to occupy the city on November 1, 1918, contrary to the provisions of the Armistice. General Marshall replied to the letter of İhsan Pasha on November 2, 1918, by saying that he had instructed his army to stop the conflicts at the exact time according to clause XXV of the Armistice; however, he had the right to occupy Mosul according to clause VII of the Armistice. Therefore, he gave necessary instructions to his army for aforementioned occupation. Selahaddin Tansel, *Mondros'tan Mudanya'ya Kadar*, Vol. I, (Ankara: Başbakanlık Basımevi, 1973), pp. 39-40.

British army achieved to enter into Mosul on November 10, 1918.²⁴² In addition to Mosul, the British soldiers subjugated İskenderun and Antakya between the dates of November 5, 1918, and November 10, 1918. Also, they continued their occupations by landing troops to Samsun, Trabzon and Merzifon.²⁴³

Like English, French also began to occupy provinces in the South. They gained control over Adana, its vicinage, and Halep. Although English had occupied the cities, like Maraş, Antep, İskenderun, and Kilis; later, they left them to the control of French military authorities. Then, French continued to advance through Urfa and Mardin. The Italians also did not refrain from occupation of Antalya, Marmaris, Bodrum, Fethiye, and Konya.²⁴⁴ In addition to this occupations, the Allied powers demanded the immediate evacuation of three Provinces, namely *Kars, Ardahan and Batum*, ten days after the signing of the Mondros Armistice.²⁴⁵ Meanwhile, the French and especially the officers started to encourage the Greek (Rum), Armenian priests, and spies to break the law and order inland.²⁴⁶

Although Admiral Calthorpe had orally assured his counter-part Rauf Bey, that there would be no Allied military presence in İstanbul, fifty-five warships of the Allies, which included British, French, Italian and Greek navies, passed through the Dardanelles and anchored off the Golden Horn on November 13, 1918. The Allied forces began to settle in the forts both sides of the Bosphorus. Additionally, Admiral Calthorpe had promised to Rauf Bey that no Greek warship would come to İstanbul or İzmir.²⁴⁷ Yet the Allies, mainly English, broke their promises and anchored some

²⁴² Nejat Göyünç, "Musul, Misak-ı Milliye Dahil Midir, Değil Midir?", *Misak-ı Milli ve Türk Dış Politikasında Musul*, (Ankara: AAMY, 1998), p. 48.

²⁴³ Haluk Selvi, *Milli Mücadele'de İlk İşgaller ve İlk Direnişler*, (İstanbul: Yeditepe Yayınevi, 2011), pp. 26-27.

²⁴⁴ Göyünç, *Ibid.*, p. 49; Türkgeldi, *Moudros ve Mudanya Mütarekelerinin...* p. 113.

²⁴⁵ The evacuations of these provinces were not conducted so quickly because the 9th Army Commander Yakup Şevki Pasha was moving too slowly to evacuate the provinces. These heavy behaviors annoyed especially the British authorities. For this reason, they were oppressing the Ottoman government to accelerate it. The government also attributed the reasons of delaying not to the members of the army, but to the weather conditions. While the correspondences were maintaining, the British authorities subjugated Batum on December 17-18, 1918 by sending two warships to Harbor of Batum. Tansel, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 58-59.

²⁴⁶ Ahmet İzzet Pasha, *Ibid.*, p. 51.

²⁴⁷ Türk İstiklal Harbi, Vol. I, p. 20; İnan, *Ibid.*, p. 22; Koloğlu, *Ibid.*, p. 95. After the Ottoman government had been informed about the arrival of the Greek warships, authorities reminded the promises of Calthorpe about Greeks and asked him to block the arrival of the Greek warships.

of their battleships in front of the building of Ottoman Parliament and Dolmabahçe Palace, in which the Sultan lived. Also, 3,500 troops of the victorious states were waiting on the ships to be disembarked and placed in the forts of Bosphorus.

Meanwhile, Christians in Beyoğlu made shows and they screamed by saying *Zito Venizelos!*, or *Long Live Venizelos*.²⁴⁸ On November 14, 1918, the İstanbul fortifications were evacuated by the Turks and the Allies settled. With subsequent arrivals, the number of ships gradually increased and reached totally one hundred sixty seven ships. Thus, the Allies actually occupied İstanbul because military officers of them seized many official and private buildings in İstanbul. However, İstanbul was not considered as occupied officially in spite of all this great supervision.²⁴⁹ Additionally, French journalist Asquit had shown their real intentions of coming to İstanbul as follows:

... We have taken a step forward by destroying the worst administration that the centuries have ever seen. Big patient is on his deathbed. We should hope that this patient is experiencing his last days as an eviler power in the midst of the family of nations. I do not know what will be written on the grave, but the Ottoman State will not be able to resurrect again after it has died.²⁵⁰

There were many reports, related to coming of war fleet of the Allies to İstanbul and the newspapers headlined the news, along with the photographs of the occupying ships. Velid Ebuzziya, the editor of *Tasvir-i Efkar*, wrote like that:

Yesterday, the capital of the Caliphate witnessed with a complete sadness and pain in the exercise and execution of one of the heaviest terms of the Armistice. Especially the British battleships, French, Italian and even Greek ships entered the Port of İstanbul one by one from the beginning of the morning, and some of them anchored in front of the Palace, some in the Bosphorus, some in front of the

However, the Admiral replied, *I can not prevent the Greek warships to come to İstanbul because I received orders from my government*. Because Britain said that the Turkish requests about the entry of Greek battleships into İstanbul would not be accepted, but they would be kept behind as far as possible. *Türk İstiklal Harbi*, Vol. I, pp. 117-118. Therefore, the Greek warships could not come close to Bosphorus and they had to anchored in offshores of Ahırkapı. Tansel, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 62.

²⁴⁸ The German General Lemon von Sanders, who was in İstanbul in those days, wrote in his memoirs: "British and French troops landed. When enemy troops entered İstanbul, Beyoğlu took a Greek cityscape rather than a Turkish city. Greek flags were hanged in the majority of houses. In front of the Entente soldiers, a Levantine was walking, accompanied with band, throwing flowers to officers and enlisted mans, throwing their hats into the air with screams of joy, hugging each other and walking by cheering over." See Limon Von Sander, *Türkiye'de Beş Yıl*, Trans. By M. Şevki Yazman, (İstanbul: Baha Matbaası, 1968), p. 356.

²⁴⁹ Selvi, *Ibid.*, p. 33; Tansel, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 55; İnan, *Ibid.*, p. 22.

²⁵⁰ Quoted from Selvi, *Ibid.*, p. 33.

Selimiye Barrack... While the faces and eyes of some of the people, who gathered at the Bridge to watch the ships coming yesterday, scattered an unbelievable light of joy, the expressions and attitudes of the majority, which was true son of the country, showed how deeply wounded they were in their hearts.²⁵¹

These emotional lines proved that the nationalist press in İstanbul was deeply in sorrow because of the Allied occupation of İstanbul. Especially the presence of Greek warship in the Port of İstanbul gave more pain to the patriotic journalist rather than that of Allies. The paper emphasized that some of the people were very happy to see the Allied soldiers, but majority expressed its sadness with its attitude.

Another nationalist newspaper, *Vakit* wrote that:

The Greek Battleship Averof was found in the fleet of Allies and that the warships left at the port of İzmit after three hours anchorage. Also, the newspaper reported that a delegation among high bureaucrats from the ministries of Foreign Affairs, War and Maritime went to Agamemnon, the flagship of Admiral Calthorpe, to say ‘‘Welcome’’ on behalf of the Ottoman government.²⁵²

As far as it is understood from the tone of the paper that paper was annoyed the political attitude of the government towards the enemy. It used sarcastic language about the kind reception of enemy warships.

In response to the pro-British demonstrations, the French Commander-in-chief of the Eastern Armies, d'Esperey took a spectacular walk on the white horse's back, from Sirkeci to Beyoğlu, among the voices of band and the demonstrations of the Greek and Armenian minorities on January 8, 1919. Two people were holding the reins of the horse, as it was in the Roman emperors. Even some historians claim that General d'Esperey came to İstanbul as ‘‘an emperor’’.²⁵³ He wanted to live in Dolmabahçe Palace, so he asked that the Sultan should be removed from there. These demands and attitudes of d'Esperey, even enraged the British authorities, became a *Black Day* for the Turks.²⁵⁴

²⁵¹ *Tasvir-i Efkar*, No.2560, 14 Teşrin-i Sani 1334 [14.11.1918], p. 1.

²⁵² *Vakit*, No.381, 14 Teşrin-i Sani 1334 [14.11.1918], p. 1.

²⁵³ Taha Akyol, *1919-1920, Mondros, Sevr ve Kuva-yı Milliye*, (İstanbul: Doğan Egmont Yayıncılık, 2016), p. 118.

²⁵⁴ Selvi, *Ibid.*, p. 37.

The editor of *Hadisat*, Süleyman Nazif published an article entitled ‘‘A Black Day’’. This little resistance to the French humiliation had been a consolation for many Turks. In his article, he expressed his emotions like that:

The demonstration, organized by a number of our citizens, on the occasion of the coming of the French general to our city, opened a wound, bleeding till the end of time, in the heart of the Turkic and Islamic people. If centuries passed and the present sadness and decadence disappear and become greatness, we will feel this pain again and we will leave this sadness and sorrow to our children and descendants as heritage, crying from generation to generation.²⁵⁵

Sparks of the National Struggle began to be fired by the first Allied occupation of İstanbul. The entry of battleships of Allies, particularly Greeks warships, into İstanbul on November 13, 1918, on the grounds of ‘‘military control’’ and the arrival of the French General d'Esperey to İstanbul with an attitude of insulting the Turkish nation on January 8, 1919, damaged the honor of the Turkish nation.²⁵⁶

Under these circumstances some organizations in İstanbul held a meeting and issued a declaration in which they expressed a desire for national unity. Moreover, separate organizations such as the Society for the Protection of the Rights of the Ottoman Peoples (Müdafaa-i Hukuk-ı Osmaniye) in İzmir and the Society of Trakya Paşaeli began to be formed in different parts of the country towards the end of this year.²⁵⁷ The Turkish people started to take action against all evil practices and occupations of the Allied powers by gathering congresses and establishing organizations of defense of the rights. Thus, people tried to defend the legitimate right of independence.

3.1.3. The Occupation of İzmir and its Effects on the National Movement

The interests of Greece on the Western Anatolia have been dated back a long time. The Western Anatolian issue was first dealt with scope of the policy called "Megali Idea" which lasted from the first half of 19th century to the first three decades of 20th

²⁵⁵ *Hadisat*, No.63, 9 Şubat 1335 [09.02.1919], p. 1.

²⁵⁶ Akyol, *Ibid.*, p. 116.

²⁵⁷ İnan, *Ibid.*, p. 22.

century.²⁵⁸ Therefore, Greece entered into the World War I on side of the Allied powers with the enthusiasm to realize the Megali Idea.²⁵⁹ Therefore, at the end of the war, Venizelos wanted to be ceded the lands, such as İstanbul, Marmara region, and Thrace as well as all Western part of Anatolia from Fethiye to Erdek to Greece, as a reward in return for the services and self- sacrifices of war.²⁶⁰ As for the Allied plans for İzmir, in spite of having been promised to Italy earlier with the London Treaty of 1915, they, especially Britain, planned that the Greeks should be permitted to occupy İzmir and its hinterland because English sought to settle a weak Greece in Western Anatolia instead of a strong Italy.²⁶¹

The Supreme Council, which was composed of representatives of the Allied powers, held a conference in Paris on May 10, 1919, so as to negotiate and design the Greek occupation of İzmir. In the course of negotiations, Lloyd George, British Prime Minister, supported to be granted İzmir and its hinterland to Greece and succeeded to win over Wilson, President of USA, to the side of Greece. Clemenceau, French Prime Minister, raised no objections. Hence, the decision to let the Greek army send troops to İzmir was made by President Wilson, Clemenceau and Lloyd George. The Italians -even though they were supposedly a part of the Big Four- were not even accredited. Italy strongly opposed this decision and left the meeting. The Supreme Council moved generally in the favor of Greece and decided to give permission Greece to occupy İzmir.²⁶² Regarding to this issue, *İzmir'e Doğru* published a news

²⁵⁸ It is possible to translate the Word, which has been mistakenly written as "Megalo Idea", and which has been actually spelled "Megali Idea", into English as "Big Ideal" or "Big Goal". The idea was rested on the aim to save all the Greeks who were in 'slave' status and create a great Greek state whose capital was İstanbul. Damla Demiröz, "Megali İdea'dan Ankara Antlaşması'na (1930) Eleftherios Venizelos", *Ankara Üniversitesi TİTE-AYD*, No: 35-36 (2005), p. 296.

²⁵⁹ Actually, it can be say for Venizelos himself. There was a great debate about entering the war just before the First World War. King Constantinos pursued a pro-German policy related to the war. However, Venizelos supported the Allies in order to achieve the Mega Idea of Greece. This political controversy between the King and Venizelos also resonated with the public and caused to a "National Partition" before the war. Damla Demiröz, *Savaşın Barışa Giden Yol: Atatürk Dönemi Türkiye -Yunanistan İlişkileri*, (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2007), p. 24.

²⁶⁰ Mustafa Turan, "İzmir'in İşgali Üzerine", *AAMD*, Vol. XII, No. 36 (1996), p. 742.

²⁶¹ Kenan Kırkpınar, *Ulusal Kurtuluş Savaşı Dönemi İngiltere ve Türkiye (1919 – 1922)*, (İstanbul: Pohenix, 2004), p. 67.

²⁶² The Allies tried to fulfill the desire of Eleftherios Venizelos and legitimized his claims about Western Anatolia with a lie that the Turks had slaughtered the Christians in the region. In addition to this, Venizelos argued that the population of Greeks (Rums) was about 188.539 in the region, mainly in İzmir. Western Anatolia and Islands were a natural extension of Greece. Kırkpınar, *Ibid.*, pp. 65-66.

by the end of March in 1920 by taking from Italian newspapers. The details of the news are as follows:

In a speech delivered by the Catholic representative in the Italian Parliament, it was stated that the statistical data, presented at the official meetings especially at the Paris Peace Conference, did not reflect the truth and they misled. In addition, it was told that the events, which was claimed to occur before the invasion of İzmir, had no relation with the reality, and that the Greeks did not constitute the majority in this region. On the contrary, very different from what Italians know, there were an Islamic people who could not utter their voices and be exposed to tyrannical behaviours. It was recalled that the news from Anatolia had already been completely negative before the occupation of İzmir and that Greeks (Rums) took sides of occupying forces with their aggressive attitudes during the process of occupation of İzmir. All these were prevented to be spread over by the censorship on the telegrams sent to the newspapers and agencies.²⁶³

As it can be understood from the news that Italy knew that all claims of Venizelos were wrong and he deceived the Supreme Council with his false data. More importantly, it can be deduced from the news that Italy noticed that the Supreme Council consented to be deceived by Venizelos.

On May 14, 1919, the Allies sent memorandums to both İzmir and the Sublime Port İstanbul about the occupation of İzmir. On the other hand, some nationalist and anti-nationalist journals, like *İkdam* and *Sabah* were able to print the official proclamations in their issues dated as May 16, 1919. According to the proclamation, Admiral Calthorpe, who had previously received the decision of the Supreme Council, informed the commander of Seventeenth Army Corps, Ali Nadir Pasha in İzmir and Governor of İzmir Ahmet İzzet²⁶⁴ that the forts of İzmir was going to be occupied by the Allied forces in accordance with the Paris Conference decisions based on clause VII of the Armistice. In addition to this, Admiral Richard Webb also sent a similar memorandum to Sublime Port in the same day, declaring that the Greek army would be involved in the occupation. The Government should have attempted to carry out its responsibility so as to protect the law of the people and the

²⁶³ *İzmir'e Doğru*, No.43, 24 Mart 1336 [24.03.1920], p. 1.

²⁶⁴ After Ahmet İzzet had taken the memorandum, he demanded to meet with Calthorpe. They had a long meeting in the armored ship "*Iron Duke*" on May 14, 1919, and Ahmet İzzet learned that the next day İzmir would be occupied by the Greeks, not the Allies. However, he hidden it from the public. Türkmen Parlak, *İşgalden Kurtuluşa "1", Yunan Ege'ye Nasıl Geldi "İlk Günler"*, (İzmir: Duyal Matbaacılık, 1982), pp. 323-325.

state.²⁶⁵ Damat Ferid informed Admiral Webb that he had sent a telegram to Ahmet İzzet to obey to the instructions of Calthorpe.²⁶⁶

As soon as received information of the Greek occupation, a group of Turkish Nationalist, who were members of *Society of No Annexation* (Redd-i İlhak Cemiyeti), held a meeting of protest, in favour of the Wilson principles and against any form of annexation, in the Jewish cemetery, (Yahudi Maşatlığı, Bahri Baba Mezarlığı), on May 14, 1919. At the end of the meeting, it was decided to defend the homeland against the occupier.²⁶⁷

On the morning of May 15, 1919, Calthorpe sent the second memorandum to Ali Nadir Pasha and Ahmet İzzet, announcing that “the forces of Greek” were permitted to occupy İzmir on the behalf of the Allied powers based on clause VII of the Armistice.²⁶⁸ Then, twenty thousand Greek troops under the control of the Allied Fleet began to land in İzmir, advanced inside of the city up the railway, and set up their standards of invasion and conquest in Western Anatolia. The commander of Seventeenth Army Corps Ali Nadir Pasha proposed to resist, with the few Turkish troops which still remained under arms, and sent telegraph accordingly to İstanbul. Fevzi (Çakmak) Pasha, the Chief of the General Staff, had previously urged that any incursion should be met by force.²⁶⁹ However, Şakir Pasha, the Minister of War, without consulting him, gave orders against resistance, on the grounds that the

²⁶⁵ *İkdam*, No.7998, 16 Mayıs 1335 [16.05.1919], p. 1; *Sabah*, No.10597, 16 Mayıs 1335 [16.05.1919], p. 1.

²⁶⁶ Ali Fuat Cebesoy tells us who was responsible for the occupation of İzmir: “*Were only the victorious states and the British guilty? No doubt no. The Sultan and governments of Damat Ferid Pasha, were submissive to their injudicious demands, were also guilty. They were also responsible for the occupation of İzmir. In the months immediately preceding the occupation, Damat Ferid Pasha appointed a governor like İzzet Bey, a commander like Ali Nadir Pasha, who gave all kinds of easeness for occupation, and shattered the spirituality of patriotic Aegean people. He prevented the organizations and preparations of the patriotic people, demobilized the army, handed over weapons and ammunition and war material depots and enabled Greeks to come ashore as if they were parading.*” Cebesoy, *Ibid.*, p. 58. Ali Nadir Pasha was accused of facilitating the occupation of İzmir and Mustafa Kemal Pasha described him as “*traitor and coward*”. Tansel, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 183-184.

²⁶⁷ Nurdoğan Taçalan, *Ege’de Kurtuluş Savaşı Başlarken*, (İstanbul: Milliyet Yayınları, 1970), p. 232; Parlak, *Ibid.*, pp. 331-332.

²⁶⁸ Parlak, *Ibid.*, pp. 325-326; Tansel, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 189.

²⁶⁹ Bilge Umar, *İzmir’de Yunanlıların Son Günleri*, (Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1974), p. 109; Lord Kinross, *Atatürk: The Rebirth of A Nation*, (Northern Cyprus: K. Rustem&Brother, 1964), p. 154.

landings accorded with the terms of the Armistice. Fevzi Pasha immediately resigned.²⁷⁰

The Greeks thus entered İzmir as though on parade, shouting *Long Live Venizelos!* They gattered their guns and began to dance around the stacks in celebration. The Greek civilian population swept along the streets and cursed violently crying Muslims. In the meantime, a stray shot was fired, which led to intermittent firing and bloodshed. This shot was fired by Hasan Tahsin while the Greek army walked towards the Konak Square, and then a great turmoil emerged in the area. On this occasion, the Greeks immediately started massacres against the Turkish people and hundreds of Turks were killed. According to Italian sources, more than 400 Turks were killed only in the events of May 15, 1919. Their bodies were thrown over the sea.²⁷¹

After a short firefight, the Turkish troops hoisted the white flag and with their officier, Ali Nadir Pasha, were marched down to the waterfront to at troop-ship with their hands above their heads. The Greek soldiers struck at the Turkish soldiers with clubs and tore at their *fes* while a mob of civilians jeered at them.²⁷² The Turkish Colonel Süleyman Fethi Bey, *the Head of the Military Service*, refused to take off his *fes* and to say *Long Live Venizelos!*; therefore, he was persecuted and shot. Later, he was taken to the Italian ship as injured, and became a martyr.²⁷³ Also, the governor Ahmet İzzet was arrested and similarly marched to the waterfront, at the point of bayonet. Other many notables were dragged from their houses. Although the Ottoman government had clearly explained that the Greek atrocity should be

²⁷⁰ Ali Nadir Pasha got in contact with the Minister of War, Şakir Pasha and stated that Admiral Calthorpe sent a memorandum the Greek occupation of İzmir and that the situation had been reported to Sublime Port previously. Şakir Pasha replied that the Sublime Port had no information about the occupation and that the attempt of Admral accorded with the terms of Mondros Armistice and should be obeyed the instructions. Although Ali Nadir Pasha had cautioned Şakir Pasha that there were some rumors that this occupation would be result in Greek invasion, he said, "*Do not focus on such rumors.*" Turan, *Ibid.*, pp. 743-744.

²⁷¹ Bülent Çukurova, "15 Mayıs 1919 İzmir'de Yunan Mezalimi", *AAMD*, Vol. III, No. 8 (1987), pp. 463-467; Taçalan, *Ibid.*, pp. 249-250; Parlak, *Ibid.*, p. 341; Kinross, *Ibid.*, p. 154. For further information about Hasan Tahsin or his real name Osman Nevres, one of the symbolic names of National Struggle, See Umar, *Ibid.*, pp. 116-166; Nail Moralı, *Mütarekede İzmir, Önceleri ve Sonraları*, prep. By Erkan Serçe, (İzmir: İzmir Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür Yayını, 2002), p. 104.

²⁷² Kinross, *Ibid.*, p. 154.

²⁷³ Taçalan, *Ibid.*, pp. 251-252; Umar, *Ibid.*, pp. 169-174; Parlak, *Ibid.*, pp. 354-360.

punished, the cabinet of Damat Ferid did not take the necessary measures against the Greek invasion, which had been turned into the slaughter and destruction. This slaughter had continued for days, İstanbul could not show any reaction, except for protesting.²⁷⁴

The most important effect of the Greek occupation of İzmir on the National Struggle was to strike the truth to the face of Turkish nation like a slap. The Greek occupation of İzmir caused to the stiff and deep indignation, which gave sudden reality to the National movement. Occupation by the great powers could be accepted as an indispensable evil; however, occupation by the Greeks, insolent and disloyal subjects of a century past, was an insult which no patriotic Turk could endure. In this regard, *İleri* was writing by focusing the annexation of İzmir by Greeks:

Our worries have eased, but they have not disappeared. The public is rightfully shocked and shows its sorrow because the rights to invade an important city like İzmir had been granted to a country, which has not fought against anyone in World War I and has never stopped having a grudge against the Ottoman Empire.²⁷⁵

Therefore, the Greeks gained hatred of the Turkish people. In addition, the Greek occupation of İzmir had positive influence on awakening of national emotions of Turkish nation. In other words, this occupation prepared the spark that was needed to inflame the fighting spirit of the Turks.²⁷⁶ As a matter of fact, the Turkish War of Independence was born from the invitation to resist against the Greek occupation of İzmir and this incident created effect of resistance all over Anatolia.²⁷⁷ On this point, İzzet Öztoprak has also interpreted the event in this manner:

The occupation of İzmir had a positive effect on the integration and consolidation of the people of Anatolia. As all these things are taken into account, the writings of the foreign press, published at various times, indicated the Greek occupation of İzmir as the reason for emergencing of Anatolian Resistance.²⁷⁸

As for the news about the occupation of İzmir by the Greek forces, the newspapers could not publish much about this issue because the time between the announcement

²⁷⁴ Umar, *Ibid.*, pp. 187-189.

²⁷⁵ *İleri*, No.477, 16 Mayıs 1335 [16.05.1919], p. 1.

²⁷⁶ Kinross, *Ibid.*, p. 155. Smith, who was the representative of the occupation forces of the Allies in İzmir, stated that if the Greeks did not involve in the attempt of occupation of İzmir, the Turks would not revolt. Selvi, *Ibid.*, p. 185.

²⁷⁷ Mustafa Albayrak, *Milli Mücadele Dönemi'nde Batı Anadolu Kongreleri*, (Ankara: AAMY, 1998), p. 36.

²⁷⁸ Öztoprak, *Ibid.*, p. 62.

of the possible occupation and occurrence of the incident was very short. That is, the press did not have enough time to analyse the events. Moreover, due to the intense censorship the press could not write about the developments in İzmir because Damat Ferid Pasha cabinet did not want to be heard the occupation to protect the order. However, Turkish newspapers could publish only the news of proclamations, meetings, and telegrams of protest about the occupation.²⁷⁹ Apart from this, the main news about the occupation was generally taken from foreign newspapers.

Moreover, *İleri* also printed a small article in regard to the news of the occupation of İzmir, even though there were many estimations and wishful thinking that could be detected in its language. There was a shock along with desperation and it was not exactly known what was going on in İzmir. The article made following comments under the title of “Occupation of İzmir.”

For the past two days, there have been despairing rumours in İstanbul: supposedly, İzmir has been occupied by the Greek forces. It was also stated that at a time when the general public has expected for the “sun of justice which will rise from the West,” the effects of this news were devastating for the people, and led them to a state of hopelessness.²⁸⁰

In addition to *İleri*, another nationalist paper, *Hadisât*, on May 17, 1919, also considered that permitting the Greeks to occupy İzmir, “a city whose historical and racial rights lie with the Turks so clearly that it is almost tangible,” was “an immediate execution of Turkish national existence.”²⁸¹

İleri acknowledged that the occupation was unjust and unfounded and as the presence of the Greek army in İzmir was against the Wilson Principles. On this point, *İleri* wrote: “But I do not believe... I cannot believe that the Wilson Principles that were declared to the world were just written in order to glare the people and to create a false sense of hope in their hearts.”²⁸²

²⁷⁹ For further information, See Şirin Güneşer Erzurum, “The Greek Occupation of İzmir and Protest Meetings in İstanbul 15 May 1919 – 13 January 1920”, (U.M.T.), (İstanbul: Boğaziçi University, 2015), pp. 37-195.

²⁸⁰ *İleri*, No.477, 16 Mayıs 1335 [16.05.1919], p. 1.

²⁸¹ *Hadisat*, No.137, 17 Mayıs 1335 [17.05.1919], p. 1.

²⁸² *İleri*, No.478, 17 Mayıs 1335 [17.05.1919], p. 1.

Hadisat also took a similar attitude towards the Wilson's Principles. It was stated that "...we are still hopeful that the Wilson's Principles will not remain as a utopian theory." The paper published the clause XII of Wilson's Principles with the memorandum prepared by the SDR of İzmir (İzmir Müdafaa-i Hukuk Cemiyeti) to shout Europe and America that "İzmir is Turkish and Muslim; that it is a righteous part of Anatolia racially, historically and economically." Hence, they shared the article XII of Principles which is stated that "portions of the Ottoman Empire where the Turks were in a majority should remain under the Turkish rule" with the research done by SDR of İzmir, which challenged the Greek claims on the territory with historical arguments. According to journal, it demographically proved that the area was inhabited mostly by Turks; argued that the disputed area fell within *the Turkish portion* of the Ottoman Empire; and that the occupation directly contradicted the Wilson's Principles.²⁸³

Both *Hadisat* and *İleri* addressed to the Allied powers with a feeling of betrayal and an invocation. Also it is clearly seen that these papers expected them to reaffirm the Wilson's Principles because both newspapers argued that the occupation was in direct violation of these principles.

Furthermore, the İstanbul press was able to report the protest meetings. For example, anti-nationalists journal, *Hadisat* gave coverage to the protest meeting in Fatih on May 20, 1919. The journal tried to offer description of the environment in more detail, which brought out the human character of the massive gathering. The article began to tell the suffering caused by the occupation of İzmir and the crowd in Fatih. The journal narrated the situation with the following statements:

A national unity: The gathering was a huge relief. In the afternoon there was an impressive sight in the streets of İstanbul. Shops were closed down and the owners were waiting on the sidewalks with others. All faces exhibited a nervousness that is peculiar to extraordinary days. Everyone had the consolation that despite all the suffering that has harmed the national spirit; they were coming together as one.²⁸⁴

When looked at the reports of speeches, it can be seen that *İleri* provided us with the transcript of the speeches that were delivered that day. The first speech reported by

²⁸³ *Hadisat*, No.137, 17 Mayıs 1335 [17.05.1919], p. 1.

²⁸⁴ *Hadisat*, No.140, 20 Mayıs 1335 [20.05.1919], p. 1.

İleri was by Halide Edip (Adivar). She began her address with the words: “Turks and Muslims, My Brothers: we have been living the darkest day of our life. There was a horrible and endless night, but in the end, it would be torn apart and a brighter and prosperous morning will be created.”²⁸⁵ The next paragraph in her speech is rather worthy of note:

Turks and Muslims! As our bright and majestic past has luminous days, our country also has sins. But brothers, no matter however it is, a clean and innocent blood has flown over. Such boiling blood has flown over for these holy lands were enough to wash away not only our small sins, but the sins of the whole Turkish nation.²⁸⁶

The press also published news about protest meeting in the Sultanahmet Square held on May 23, 1919. The general atmosphere described in anti-nationalist paper, *Alemdar*, was one of sorrow. Everyone's face was filled with sadness; and even the little children had tears in their eyes. It was further stated that:

The rising emotional sound of the speeches that we report below trembled hearts. The sobs were shaking chests. At that moment sounds of “sela and tekbir” could be heard from the minarets of the Sultanahmet Mosque. The domes of the mosques were trembling. İstanbul was shaking to its tiniest bits. These tekbirs were not just the voices of İstanbul, Anatolia and the entire Turkish homeland, but they were also the unified sounds of the lands that five hundred million Muslims inhabit.²⁸⁷

Moreover, *Hadisat* also published about the Sultanahmet Meeting. The paper wrote that “yesterday was truly a great day recorded in history and an event that proved how deeply the country was devoted to its sultan.” The newspaper also argued that “İstanbul could not have seen such a day since its first stone was laid.” It was claimed that the gathering was the day when “All Muslims and Turks of İstanbul became a single heart and prayed to God and took refuge in him, declaring to the world, to their friends and enemies that they are one, in procuring their rights.”²⁸⁸

²⁸⁵ *İleri*, No.481, 20 Mayıs 1335 [20.05.1919], p. 1.

²⁸⁶ “Türkler ve Müslümanlar, Kardeşlerim! Bugün hayatımızın en kara bir gününü yaşıyoruz. Sabahı olmayan bir nihayetimiz, karanlık bir gece içerisindeyiz. Fakat bu kadar karanlıklardan sonra inşallah hepimizin üzerinde daha parlak, daha feyizli bir sabah olacaktır. Türkler ve Müslümanlar! Mazimizde ve tarihimizde en şanlı ve yüksek günlerimiz olduğu gibi, günahlarımız da var. Fakat Ey Kardeşler! Ne olursa ne kadar olursa olsun temiz ve masum bir kan akmıştır. Bu mübarek topraklar için o kadar kan akmıştır ki, bu kan sadece küçük günahlarımızı değil, bütün Türk milletinin günahını ödemeye kafidir. *İleri*, No.481, 20 Mayıs 1335 [20.05.1919], p. 1.

²⁸⁷ *Alemdar*, No.152-1462, 24 Mayıs 1335 [24.05.1919], p. 1.

²⁸⁸ *Hadisat*, No.144, 24 Mayıs 1335 [24.05.1919], p. 1.

Apart from the İstanbul press, some nationalist newspapers like *Albayrak* and *Açıksöz* were able to issue news after a long time related to the occupation of İzmir by the Greeks because of the pressure of the İstanbul Government, which prevented to spread of information about the event. The publications of Anatolian press were important in terms of the attitude of Anatolian people towards the Greek occupation. *Albayrak* published the protest telegraph sent by the SDR of Erzurum to the Sublime Port. The telegraph sent on November 12, 1919, briefly asked the Government to make necessary attempts so as to cease the cruelty of the Greeks.²⁸⁹

Açıksöz published the news of the third Sultanahmet meeting held on October 15, 1919, and the proclamation sent to the representatives of the Allied powers. *Açıksöz* narrated the news as follows:

We read in the newspapers that an enormous meeting was held in Sultanahmet after the Friday prayer due to the occupation of İzmir, which cannot be erased forever from the heart of the Turk. ...In this meeting, which was held to inform the Peace Conference that it is time to give orders for the evacuation of İzmir and to ask for the repair of this injustice that hurts the heart of Turkish-Muslims, the heart of Anatolia beats with the people of İstanbul. The proclamation that the meeting delegation presented to Allied representatives is below.²⁹⁰

The newspaper also published the proclamation, which was consisted of mainly three articles. This manifesto submitted to the Allied representatives embraced the important points, such as unjustified the Greek occupation, the persecutions and destruction committed by the Greeks against the Turkish elements, and calling the Allies for end of the occupation.

The protest meetings about the Greek occupation of İzmir were held until the end of May in 1919, and the newspapers were full of the news about these meetings and protests. All of these demonstrations showed that the Turkish nation did not yet loose its hope to defend the sacred right of independence. Further, all these speeches and meetings prepared the ground for awakening of national resistance feelings in heart of Turkish people.

In addition to this news, some newspapers gave wide coverage to the news from foreign press concerning the occupation of İzmir. On this point, *Alemdar* published

²⁸⁹ *Albayrak*, No.44, 12 Teşrin-i Sani 1335 [12.11.1919], p. 1.

²⁹⁰ *Açıksöz*, No.17, 19 Teşrin-i Evvel 1335 [19.10.1919], p. 4.

news taken from the French press. The paper dwelled on the real invader of İzmir as follows:

“In the issue of occupation of İzmir by Greeks, the reason for the Greeks is to conform to the interests of the Allied powers rather than their wishes. It is a big mistake to claim the opposite.” These kinds of arguments took part especially in the French press. As far as known by reflects of İstanbul press, it has been argued even in the French newspapers that “the French political circles do not know yet under which conditions the occupation was carried out and what kinds of authority given the occupiers, or the Greeks.”²⁹¹

It can be inferred from the news that the occupation of İzmir by the Greeks served the purpose of the Allies, or Britain, not their own desires. Also, the fact that the French policy makers did not know the scope of the occupation and authority given the Greeks revealed the political disintegration between France and Britain. It looks like that British statesman could move without consulting their French counterparts.

Another influent, newspaper, *Vakit* quoted an article of *Times* on July 9, 1919. After the paper mentioned the inhuman treatments implemented by Greeks against Turkish people, it dwells on the possible ethnic conflict:

The majority of the people, living in the region wanted by the Greeks, were Muslim, and not only the big landowners in İzmir but also the whole Western Anatolian peoples are opposed to grant the İzmir Province and the lands in the north and south of the gulf to the Greeks.²⁹²

The news has continued to pull attention towards the geographical, economic, strategic position of İzmir, and negative outcomes of the Greek occupation. In this regard, paper has emphasized:

İzmir is the only export center of Anatolia, and the Turks know very well that the Anatolian trade would be constantly shaken due to the presence of the Greek in this region. In deed, the city, which had not suffered much in the course of the First World War, would suffer heavy losses. Because a wrong move by the Greek

²⁹¹ *Alemdar*, No. 196-1506, 9 Temmuz 1335 [01.07.1919], p. 1. From *Moniteur*.

²⁹² *Vakit*, No.609, 9 Temmuz 1335 [09.07.1919], p. 1. From *Times*.

government to carry out the necessary administrative arrangements for the regular administration structure would subvert everything.²⁹³

In addition to these considerations, the newspaper suggested that for the solution of the problem:

Turkey should ne taken under a strict foreign administration and the lands, which the majority of the Greeks lived, should be subjected to the same administration. Then, few generations later, it would be offered the Greeks to prefer one of the European or American, and Turkish or Greek administration.²⁹⁴

Another Swiss newspaper *Journal de Geneve* reported news based on the correspondent of İzmir and this news mentioned the geographical location of İzmir and recalled that the city was the gate of the Aegean region. Also, it has empahasized that the occupation of the Aydın Province by the Greeks caused to division into the Greeks and Turks, and this would be equivalent “to destroying the place rather than revive the region.” The newspaper has recalled that the occupation was considered more or less out of season, and that 75% of the industry in Aydın, Konya and Bursa was kept in the hands of the Greek part.²⁹⁵

Among the external news about Turkey reflected in the Turkish press, the newspapers mentioned the investigation committee formed by the Supreme Council to investigate the inhuman treatments of the Greeks against the Turkish people and the report submitted by the committee to the Supreme Council. Despite Venizelos' all opposition, the assigning of such an investigation committee was formed on July 21, 1919 by the Supreme Council upon the memorandum sent on July, 15, 1919, by Mustafa Sabri Efendi, acting on behalf of the Grand Vizier Damat Ferid.²⁹⁶ The committee of investigation was consisted of the British General Hare, the French General Bunoust, and the Italian General Dall'Olio under the presidency of the American Admiral Bristol.²⁹⁷ Albay Kadri from the Turks and Mazarakis from the Greeks participated in this delegation as the consultant, but they had no right to vote. The committee held its first meeting in İstanbul on August 4, 1919, and later went to

²⁹³ *Vakit*, No.609, 9 Temmuz 1335 [09.07.1919], p. 1. From *Times*.

²⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 1. From *Times*.

²⁹⁵ *İkdam*, No.8056, 14 Temmuz 1335 [14.07.1919], p. 1. From *Journal de Geneve*.

²⁹⁶ Gotthard Jaeschke, *Türk Kurtuluş Savaşı Kronolojisi*, (Ankara: TTK, 1970), p. 51.

²⁹⁷ *Vakit*, No.634, 2 Ağustos 1335 [02.08.1919], p. 2. From *Le Journal*. For the committee report, See Enver Ziya Karal, *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Tarihi (1918-1953)*, (İstanbul: Cumhuriyet Matbaası, 1954), p. 71.

Aegean region, and listened to the Turks and Greeks in İzmir, Aydın, Nazilli, Çine, Ödemiş, Menemen, Manisa and Ayvalık.²⁹⁸

Around these days, when an international investigation commission was assigned by the Supreme Council in July 1919, in order to make examinations in Western Anatolia under the Greek occupation, İkdâm published a news quoted from Swiss press, on July 14, 1919. The paper claimed that the Greek occupation was considered as out of season and even the European colonies in İzmir were not satisfied with this attempt, except for the Greek and Armenian elements. The French and British chambers of commerce in İzmir expressed their thoughts in the memorandum sent to Peace Conference: “It is required that the government, which would dominate İzmir, regardless of whomever it does, can have control all over Aydın provinces, and keep all the railways of İzmir.” The same newspaper called İzmir as the *pearl of Anatolia*. In addition, it was argued that the hastiness shown in the Paris circles for the occupation of İzmir was never welcomed in the representatives of the Allied powers in Istanbul.²⁹⁹

Another important nationalist newspaper *İleri* argued that the attempt of the Greek occupation would bring many challenges in the future. The paper also stated that the essence of such developments stemmed from the contradictory policies carried out by Allies in the East. Accordingly, it expressed that these policies would not serve the purposes of any state: “How has a policy that irritates goals and national desires, which always compete and serve to wear out each other and destroy themselves, approved in the East?”³⁰⁰

Ultimately, the French delegate, General Bunoust, submitted the original text of the report to the Paris Peace Conference on October 11, 1919. The commission report

²⁹⁸ *Peyam*, No.266-24, 25 Ağustos 1335 [25.08.1919], p. 1; *Alemdar*, No.153-1553, 25 Ağustos 1335 [25.08.1919], p. 1; *İfham*, No.28, 26 Ağustos 1335 [26.08.1919], p. 1. From *L'éclair*.

²⁹⁹ *İkdâm*, No.8056, 14 Temmuz 1335 [14.07.1919], p. 1. From *Gazet de Lausanne*. In this regard, none of the big companies, which had invested in the Aegean, do not want to be left the Aegean to Greece. For instance, American tobacco companies and large British organizations, such as Freshfield and Withall, were opposed to transfer of İzmir to Greece administration. This capital group wanted either the Aegean region to become an independent state or to be under the control of a great state like USA-England-France. İlhan Tekeli- Selim İlkin, *Ege'deki Sivil Direnişten Kurtuluş Savaşı'na Geçerken Uşak Heyet-i Merkeziyesi ve İbrahim (Tahtakılıç) Bey*, (Ankara: TTK, 1989), p. 14.

³⁰⁰ *İleri*, No.651, 1 Teşrin-i Sani 1335 [01.11.1919], p. 2. From *Le Temps*.

was entirely against the Greek occupation and the inhumane treatments implemented by the Greeks during the occupation were verified by the committee. At the end of the meeting held on November 14, 1919, the Supreme Council thanked the delegation for its impartiality in the investigation.³⁰¹ Also, the Council emphasized that Greece was guilty and that no further persecution was possible; however, the Council stated that the Greek forces would not be replaced by any other force, and expressed its full confidence to the Greek administration with respect to providing peace and security in the occupied territories.³⁰² This news aroused great excitement and despair as soon as it reached to İstanbul. *İkdam* reported that the news had not confirmed the positive rumors, circulating in İstanbul a few days ago, but the newspaper stated that we should not be hopeless. The paper published the letter sent to Venizelos by the Supreme Council in the following day. The Council reminded him that the occupation was temporary, and they were sure that the Greeks would prevent the reoccurrence of such an unpleasant events at the time of their occupation.³⁰³

Sabah, one of the important and influential anti-nationalist papers, published news quoted from the French press on November 18, 1919. The news interpreted the international committee report and said that the Supreme Council allowed the Greek occupation to remain in the region. More importantly, the paper pulled attention towards “the observation of the Council that the presence of the Greek forces in İzmir provided the Turkish National movement to expand significantly.” Hence, the news indicated that “the Supreme Council was worried about the possible bloody “retaliations” of Turkish army against the Christian people in case of withdrawal of the Greeks.” In a sense, according to the newspaper, the Council tried to show that replacing the Greek occupation forces with another state’s soldiers was not only

³⁰¹ *Vakit*, No.794, 21 Kanun-i Sani 1336 [21.01.1920], p. 1.

³⁰² Mustafa Turan, *Yunan Mezalimi (İzmir, Aydın, Manisa, Denizli-1919-1923)*, (Ankara: AAMY, 1999), pp. 310-318. Although the Allied powers did not take into account the Committee’s Report, the justification of the Turkish National Struggle were accepted for the first time by an international delegation with the provisions of this report. The National Army used this report as a weapon confirming its resistance. Karal, *Ibid.*, p. 71. Moreover, the report proved that the occupation was not justified and violated the terms of the Armistice signed between Turkey and the Allied powers. Selvi, *Ibid.*, pp. 129-130.

³⁰³ *İkdam*, No.8177, 17 Teşrin-i Sani 1335 [17.11.1919], p. 1; *Yeni Gün*, No.241, 17 Teşrin-i Sani 1335 [17.11.1919], p. 1.

matter of *purely material conditions*. In that case, the duration of the Greek occupation had to be extended. However, it should be also emphasized that it would not mean that this region was ceded politically to the Greek government. Also, paper wrote that the Council wanted the Greece to follow more moderate policy towards the Turkish Nationalists.³⁰⁴

Yeni Gün, one of the influential nationalist newspapers, also published news mentioned above on November 18, 1919. The paper criticized the decision of the Supreme Council on continuation of the Greek occupation and its worries about the possible “retaliations” of Turkish army. The gazette attributed the anxieties of the Council not to be recognized *the basic characteristics* of the Turks by Europeans.³⁰⁵

3.1.4. Movement of Mustafa Kemal Pasha to Anatolia and the First Activities

Mustafa Kemal Pasha had served as the Commander of the Seventh Army, which was subjected to *Yıldırım Army Groups* (July 11, 1917-November 7, 1918), under German General Falkenheim in Syria. After the failure in Philistine Front, German General Limon von Sanders was appointed to the commandership of army groups instead of Falkenheim on February 19, 1918. However, on October 30, 1918, the day when the Mondros Armistice was signed, Mustafa Kemal Pasha was appointed to the commandship of the *Yıldırım Army Groups* upon the invitation of Von Sanders to İstanbul.³⁰⁶ After a few days later, *Yıldırım Army Groups* and the Seventh Army were abolished with the Imperial Decree dated on November 7, 1918, and the Government called Mustafa Kemal Pasha back to İstanbul on November 10, 1918. Then, he set off in the same day.³⁰⁷

During the Armistice, Samsun and its environment lacked of order and safety because by the reason of provocations of Pontus. Supposedly, the situation behind the port of Samsun on the Black Sea stemmed from the Greek pretensions to

³⁰⁴ *Sabah*, No.10778, 18 Teşrin-i Sani 1335 [18.11.1919], p. 1. From *Le Matin*.

³⁰⁵ *Yeni Gün*, No.242, 18 Teşrin-i Sani 1335 [18.11.1919], p. 1. From *Le Matin*.

³⁰⁶ Sander, *Ibid.*, p. 353.

³⁰⁷ Sabahattin Selek, *Anadolu İhtilali*, Vol. I, (İstanbul: Kastaş Yayınevi, 2010), p. 205; Sarıhan, *Kurtuluş Savaşı'nda İkili...* p. 77.

establish an independent state of Pontus. However, the majority of Turks in the region posed a great obstacle for the Greek's historical dreams; thus, the conflict was inevitable. Accordingly, the ethnic and political conflict between the Turks and Greeks constituted the main cause of unrest in the region. The situation was assessed in a report and despatched to the British authorities to Damat Ferid Pasha on April 21, 1919, with a demand that the Ottoman government takes immediate action to restrain outrageous attacks of Turks on the Greek villages, and to re-establish law and order. Additionally, they implied that if the Government failed to implement it, the Allied forces would be obligated to intervene themselves.³⁰⁸

Grand Vizier Damat Ferid Pasha took immediate alarm and sent for Minister of Internal Affairs, Mehmet Ali Bey, with whom Mustafa Kemal and Ali Fuat had had lately negotiated, and with whom had kept in touch with him.³⁰⁹ Damat Ferid asked for his advice concerning what should be done. Mehmet Ali answered that it was clear from the British report that the situation could not be controlled neither from the center; nor the local administration equipped to cope with the problem. The only solution, he suggested, was to send a capable young officer, whom the Cabinet could trust, to Samsun. The task of this officer - Inspector - would be to combine the civil and military elements into an organization strong enough to restore the order and security. When Grand Vizier asked for the name of a suitable officer, Mehmet Ali suggested Mustafa Kemal. Afterwards, Minister of War, Şakir Pasha called Mustafa Kemal Pasha and said that the Grand Vizier considered him a suitable officer to go to Anatolia and report on the situation between Turks and Greeks. Mustafa Kemal replied that he would be pleased to go.³¹⁰

³⁰⁸ Selek, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 215-217; Akşin, *Ibid.*, Vo. I, pp. 279-280; Sarıhan, *Kurtuluş Savaşı'nda İkili...* p. 81; Kinross, *Ibid.*, p. 149.

³⁰⁹ When he was in İstanbul, he had an interview for many times with the Minister of Internal Affairs, Mehmet Ali Bey and Minister of Navy, Avni Pasha, whom he knew via Ali Fuat Pasha. With the help of these two ministers, the Cabinet obtained the chance to recognize Mustafa Kemal and get a positive opinion about him. Accordingly, the confidence of the ministers became one of the factors, perhaps the most important, that enabled Mustafa Kemal Pasha to be appointed as an Inspector of Army. Cebesoy, *Ibid.*, pp. 38-39; Selek, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 219; Akşin, *Ibid.*, Vo. I, p. 286.

³¹⁰ Akşin, *Ibid.*, Vo. I, p. 281; Selek, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 215-217; Kinross, *Ibid.*, pp. 149-150. Mustafa Kemal Pasha thought that Damat Ferid hesitated him and he had suspicion about Mustafa Kemal himself. Additionally, Mustafa Kemal claimed that this duty was a good opportunity for Damat Ferid to get himself safely out of way. Akşin, *Ibid.*, Vo. I, p. 289.

The appointment of Mustafa Kemal Pasha to Inspectorate of the Ninth Army received the approval of the Cabinet and the seal of the Sultan on April 30, 1919.³¹¹ In addition, Damat Ferid confirmed Mustafa Kemal that he had given him full authority, and added that “you can communicate to me directly all your wishes. You can be sure that they will be carried out without delay.”³¹²

The decision on the appointment of Mustafa Kemal was also declared by the Cabinet in its official Gazette, *Takvim-i Vekayi*, on May 5, 1919. The decision was published as follows: “Mustafa Kemal Pasha, had been the Commander of the Yıldırım Army Groups abolished, was appointed to the Ninth Army Inspectorate. The Minister of War is charged with the execution of this Imperial Decree.”³¹³

Among other newspapers, only *Vakit* and *İkdam* could give coverage about this appointment in their second pages; however, they did not attach particular importance, and mentioned the appointment in a plain language.³¹⁴

As for the scope of the authority, the instructions covered the restoration of order and security and an investigation into the causes of the present disturbances; the confiscation and storage of all arms and ammunition; disbandment of all groups under unofficial army protection, and the prohibition of further recruitment and distribution of weapons.³¹⁵

³¹¹ *TV*, No.3540, 5 Mayıs 1335 [05.05.1919], p. 1.; Jaeschke, *Ibid.*, p. 28; Selek, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 215-217.

³¹² Akşin, *Ibid.*, Vo. I, pp. 281-283; Kinross, *Ibid.*, p. 152. Mustafa Kemal Pasha was anti-the CUP and anti-Germany; thus, there was no contradiction with the Britain, the Sultan, and Damat Ferid Pasha. He was already recognized by the Sultan and the Cabinet as capable, powerful and patriotic. In addition, Mustafa Kemal was the honorary Adjutant “Fahri Yaver” of Sultan Vahdeddin. The Sultan was meeting with him at certain intervals. Hence, there was no reason to become suspicious about the ability and loyalty of Mustafa Kemal, whom Sultan Vahdeddin had already known him since 1917. All of these factors facilitated Mustafa Kemal to be appointed as an Inspector. Zekeriya Türkmen, *Mütareke Döneminde Ordunun Durumu Ve Yeniden Yapılanması (1918 – 1920)*, (Ankara: TTK, 2001), pp. 121- 124.

³¹³ “Mülga Yıldırım Grubu Kumandanı Mustafa Kemal Paşa Dokuzuncu Ordu Müfettişliğine tayin edilmiştir. İşbu İrade-i Seniye'nin icrasına Harbiye Nazırı memurdur.” *TV*, No.3540, 5 Mayıs 1335 [05.05.1919], p. 1.

³¹⁴ *Vakit*, No.547, 6 Mayıs 1335 [06.05.1919], p. 2; *İkdam*, No.7984, 2 Mayıs 1335 [02.05.1919], p. 2.

³¹⁵ Yücel Özkaya... [et al.]; *Gazi Mustafa Kemal Atatürk'ün Hayatı*, (Ankara: AAMY, 2012), p. 169. Selek, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 222. Mustafa Kemal explained his authority which had been given by İstanbul Government that “I was the Inspector of the Ninth Army. When I landed with my Staff at Samsun, I had two Army Corps under my personal command. One of them, the third Army Corps, whose base

Moreover, Mustafa Kemal could command the third and fifteenth army corps, with direct or indirect authority over ten provinces which were obliged to “take his demands into careful consideration.” That is, he was able to command and issue instructions to both military elements and provincial governors in his district and beyond his own. On May 8, 1919, the Ministry of War circulated these instructions for all offices, with a demand that all civil servants implement the orders of Mustafa Kemal.³¹⁶

All these authorities indicated that Mustafa Kemal Pasha, as an Inspector, could give orders almost throughout Anatolia. The Government, in a sense, put all Central and Eastern Anatolia under the command of Mustafa Kemal Pasha. In this regard, it is worthy to mention the interpretation of Former Grand Vizier Ahmet İzzet Pasha. He emphasized that:

...the extraordinary authorities given to Mustafa Kemal were as wide as no mortal had been given until now. Mustafa Kemal himself would also give instructions to the neighboring army corps and all Anatolian provinces as well as the military units in his inspecting circle and he would remove or appoint officers as he desires...³¹⁷

After making good-bye visits, Mustafa Kemal started his great political journey on May 16, 1919 and he set the foot on the land of Anatolia with his 18-person headquarters on May 19, 1919.³¹⁸ The next day of occupation of İzmir, the newspapers were giving coverage to departure of Mustafa Kemal, following the sad news. *İleri*, *İkdam*, and *Vakit* informed their readers as follows: “Mustafa Kemal Pasha, who had been appointed to the Inspectorate of the Eastern Troops, moved to

was at Sivas, and was commanded by Colonel Refet Bey, who came with me to Samsun. ...The other Army Corps under my command was the fifteenth, stationed at Erzurum, and commanded by Kazım Karabekir Pasha. ...These two Army Corps were directly under my command and I was also authorized to give orders to other troops remaining within the district of my Inspection, and in the neighbouring provinces. In virtue of the authority vested in me, I had the right to communicate and correspond with the twentieth Army Corps in Ankara, as its superior Army Inspection, as well as with the Army Corps at Diyarbakır and the heads of the Civil Administration in nearly the whole of Anatolia.” Atatürk, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 6-7.

³¹⁶ The scope of the authority of the Inspectorship contained such provinces as Trabzon, Erzurum, Sivas, Van, Erzincan, Diyarbakır, Bitlis, Elazığ, Ankara and Kastamonu. Akşin, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 281-282; Tansel, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 234. “Memurin-i mülkiyenin, Mustafa Kemal tarafından yapılacak tebliğata icra etmelerinin tamimen emir buyurulması müsterhamdır.” Jaeschke, *Ibid.*, p. 28.

³¹⁷ Ahmet İzzet Pasha, *Ibid.*, p. 62, 71.

³¹⁸ Türkmen, *Mütareke Döneminde Ordunun...*, p. 124; Fethi Tevetoğlu, *Atatürk'le Samsun'a Çıkanlar*, (Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1987), p. 16.

Samsun yesterday afternoon by Bandırma Steamer in the company of the Staff Major Hüsrev Bey and some others.’’³¹⁹

Although aforementioned newspapers mentioned the departure of Mustafa Kemal in a plain language, *Zaman* shared this news by using more colorful and impressive language. Also, the newspaper published the news with a uniformed picture of Mustafa Kemal, who put Adjutancy Braid (Yaverlik Kordonu) on it. The paper announced the news as follows:

Mustafa Kemal Pasha, the Commander of the *Yıldırım Army Groups* abolished, was appointed to the Inspectorate of the Eastern Troops. Mustafa Kemal Pasha was one of our talented high military officers, who showed extraordinary usefulness in various fronts throughout the war years. We wish success to Pasha, who will go to Erzurum within a few days to perform his new duty.³²⁰

Alemdar also shared the news of departure of Mustafa Kemal Pasha with his uniformed picture. The newspaper informed its readers as follows: ‘‘Mustafa Kemal Pasha and Commander of the Third Army Corps Colonel Refet Bey moved to Samsun yesterday at 4.p.m by boarding the Bandırma Steamer with his entourage.’’³²¹

After Mustafa Kemal landed Samsun, he sent two telegrams to İstanbul, reporting that his arrival in Samsun and starting of his duty. One of them was sent to the Minister of War and the other, special, one was written to be presented to the Sultan.³²² In addition to these letters, Mustafa Kemal reacted strongly the Greek

³¹⁹ ‘‘Şark Kıtaatı Müfettişliği'ne tayin buyurulmuş olan Mustafa Kemal Paşa, maiyetinde Erkan-ı Harp Binbaşısı Hüsrev Bey ve sair bazı kişiler bulunduğu halde, dün öğleden sonra Bandırma Vapuru ile Samsun'a hareket etmiştir.’’ *İleri*, No.478, 17 Mayıs 1335 [17.05.1919], p. 1; *İkdam*, No.7999, 17 Mayıs 1335 [17.05.1919], p. 1; *Vakit*, No.558, 17 Mayıs 1335 [17.05.1919], p. 2.

³²⁰ ‘‘Mülga Yıldırım Orduları Kumandanı Mustafa Kemal Paşa Şark Kıtaatı Müfettişliği'ne tayin edilmiştir. Mustafa Kemal Paşa, harp seneleri zarfında muhtelif cephe-i harplerde fevkalade yararlıklarda bulunmuş, muktedir erkân-ı askeriyemizdendir. Yeni vazife-i memuriyetini ifa için birkaç güne (Erzurum)'a azimet edecek olan Paşa-yı müşarun ileyhe muvaffakiyetler temenni ederiz.’’ *Zaman*, No.368, 16 Mayıs 1335 [16.05.1919], p. 1.

³²¹ ‘‘Mustafa Kemal Paşa ve Üçüncü Kolordu Kumandanı Miralay Refet Bey maiyetleriyle Bandırma Vapuruna rakiben (binerek) dün saat dörtte Samsun'a müteveccihen hareket etmişlerdir.’’ *Alemdar*, No.145-1455, 17 Mayıs 1335 [17.05.1919], p. 1.

³²² ‘‘Bugün öğleden evvel saat sekizde Samsun'a varıldığının ve bana verilen vazifeye başlandığının Zat-ı Eşref-i Cenab-ı Padişahiye arz buyurulmasını rica ederim.’’ Jaeschke, *Ibid.*, p. 34.

occupation of İzmir and reflected his reaction to it in the telegram forwarded to the Government on May 20, 1919.³²³

Mustafa Kemal began to deal with the problems of public order in Samsun and its environment. He prepared a report about the situation in the region and came to conclusion that the main source of unrest in Samsun and its surrounding stemmed from the Greek gang activities. He thought that if the Government forced the Greeks to give up their political dreams rested on the independent state of Pontus, the banditry would be prevented and law and order would be reassured.³²⁴

When Mustafa Kemal was in Samsun, he made a great effort to establish a balance between three important forces: “army, nation, leader”,³²⁵ accordingly, in order to put this goal into action, Mustafa Kemal, in the military field, established rapid connection with all the Turkish army units surviving in Anatolia and Thrace. In political field, he started to make connections among the various Defence of Rights groups to establish new ones. Firstly, he began to take the army under his control with help of the patriotic, idealist and courageous Army Corps commanders, such as Kazım Karabekir, Cafer Tayyar, Ali Fuat, and Mersinli Cemal Pasha. For this reason, on May 21, 1919, he got in touch with the Commander of the Fifteenth Army Corps Kazım Karabekir Pasha in Erzurum and sent a telegram to him saying that he was saddened about the general situation and wished to join him as soon as possible, but that law and order problems would detain him in Samsun for a few days.³²⁶ Kazım Karabekir replied that he would be happy to meet him and that there was no difficulty in travelling by car from Trabzon to Erzurum, while the road to Sivas was bad and there was no petrol to be found on the way.³²⁷

On May 23, 1919, Mustafa Kemal also forwarded a new telegram to Ali Fuat Pasha, now at the head of the Twentieth Army Corps in Ankara, saying that he wanted to

³²³ “İzmir’in Yunan askerleri tarafından işgali, yakından temasta bulunduğum milleti ve orudyu tasavvur edilemeyecek derecede dilhun etmiştir... Ne millet ne de ordu mevcudiyetine karşı yapılan bu haksız tecavüzü hazım ve kabul etmeyecektir.” *Atatürk İle İlgili Arşiv Belgeleri* (1911-1921 Tarihleri Arasına Ait 106 Belge), (Ankara: Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi Daire Başkanlığı, 1982), p. 26.

³²⁴ *Atatürk İle İlgili Arşiv Belgeleri*, pp. 28-29; Özkaya... [et al.]; *Ibid.*, p. 175.

³²⁵ Refik Korkud, *Milli Mücadele Taktimi*, (Ankara: Ege Matbaası, 1963), p. 145.

³²⁶ Atatürk, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 12.

³²⁷ Kazım Karabekir, *İstiklal Harbimiz*, Vol. I, prep. By Faruk Özerengin, (İstanbul: Emre Yayınları, 2000), p. 144.

establish connection with him, and asking for news of the situation in and around İzmir.³²⁸ Both Kazım Karabekir Pasha and Ali Fuat Pasha were very pleased with the presence of Mustafa Kemal Pasha to Anatolia.³²⁹ One of the other commanders, who Mustafa Kemal Pasha corresponded with, was Mersinli Cemal Pasha in Konya. Cemal Pasha, who engaged in establishing national organization in Konya, drew the reaction of the İstanbul Government because of these nationalist activities.³³⁰ With these correspondences, Mustafa Kemal Pasha made important attempts to lay the foundations of the integration of military-nation in Samsun.

Requiring acting freely Mustafa Kemal Pasha, after a week in Samsun, moved his headquarters Havza, *district of Samsun*, on May 25, 1919. Here, he wrote a mini circular and forwarded as the telegram to governors, to the Fifteenth Army Corps in Erzurum, the Twentieth Army Corps in Ankara, the Thirteenth Army Corps in Diyarbakir, and the Army Inspectorship in Konya.³³¹ In Havza telegram dated on May 28, 1919, Mustafa Kemal addressed Turkish people as follows:

The occupation of İzmir and the unfortunate occupation of Mmanisa and Aydın that followed distinctly prove more than anything else could do how imminent the danger is. More continuity more power was must be given to the national manifestation for the preservation of the integrity our territory. Such events as occupation and annexation touch the life and independence of the country, whose entire nation is deeply agitated by these shameful attacks...³³²

The Havza telegram was the first step on the way to the National Struggle. Mustafa Kemal Pasha, who tried to attract the attention of Turkish people towards a national resistance and national independence, intended to warn the people against the danger of loosing its freedom with this manifesto. Indeed, Havza telegram paved the way for

³²⁸ Cebesoy, *Ibid.*, pp. 65-66.

³²⁹ Erdal Aydoğan, *Samsun'dan Erzurum'a Mustafa Kemal*, (Ankara: AAMY, 2000), p. 34.

³³⁰ Aydoğan, *Samsun'dan Erzurum'a...*, p. 35.

³³¹ Özkaya... [et al.]; *Ibid.*, p. 179; Akyol, *Ibid.*, p. 168.

³³² Atatürk, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 16. Genelge'nin halk üzerindeki etkisini o tarihte Havza'da Mustafa Kemal Paşa ile birlikte bulunan Kurmay Binbaşı Hüsrev (Gerede) Bey'in Havza Camii'de İzmir şehitleri adına düzenlenen mevlitten sonra defterine düştüğü şu not oldukça güzel tasvir etmektedir: "Duada halkın can ve yürekten âmin deyişleri, İzmir olaylarını, şehit arkadaşlarımızı, ulusça düştüğümüz ölümcül günleri gözler önünde canlandırdı. Savaştaki kahramanlıkların, akıtılan kanların boşa gidişi, bağımsızlığımızın tehlikede bulunuşu, duyan her yürekten ulusun kurtuluşu için iç parçalayıcı seslerle 'Amin!' nidaları çıkarttı. Kalplerdeki üzüntünün dışa vurmuş yansıması olan sıcak gözyaşları matem yüklü gözlerle iki sıra halinde akıyordu. Yarabbi, şanlı peygamberinin kutsal ruhu hürmetine sen bu zavallı milleti kurtar, tutsak eyleme!" Hüsrev Gerede, *Hüsrev Gerede'nin Anıları: Kurtuluş Savaşı, Atatürk ve Devrimler*, prep. By Sami Önal, (İstanbul: Literatür Yayıncılık, 2002), p. 31.

rouse the people to a spirit of resistance. Hence, the public staged mass-meetings of protest and bombarded the İstanbul Government and the foreign representatives with protest telegrams appealing for national justice.³³³ It is remarkable development that Mustafa Kemal Pasha started the process of ‘nationalization’ of the National Struggle³³⁴ by drawing the power and support of the whole people towards fighting. He had already believed that national and political independency of the nation could be achieved only by defending and fighting as one body.

However, the British authorities followed closely all movements of Mustafa Kemal Pasha. Based on intelligence reports of the British Captain L.H. Hurst in Samsun, Admiral Calthorpe wrote a letter to Lord Curzon, the British Minister of Foreign Affairs, on June 6, 1919, that Mustafa Kemal Pasha tried to create a new organization and many Turkish officers began to influx into Anatolia with the aim of struggle. Also, the Admiral added that these new developments were at the alarming rate.³³⁵ It is clear that the activities of Mustafa Kemal caused English to suspect about the course of events. For this reason, Admiral Calthorpe wanted Sir George Milne on the Black Sea to give necessary instruction the Ottoman government to recall Mustafa Kemal.³³⁶ Moreover, just two days later, the same demand was repeated by Admiral Calthorpe. He tried to pull attention of the Ottoman Minister of Foreign Affairs on that the malevolent people in Samsun - who were in favor of the War of National Independence - caused the disturbance and Mustafa Kemal played a leading role in these movements. Hence, the Admiral asked the Ottoman Ministry of War to give order Mustafa Kemal to return.³³⁷

Upon the persistent demands of Milne and Calthorpe, the Government decided on recall of Mustafa Kemal and the War Minister Şevket Turgut Pasha asked Mustafa Kemal to return to İstanbul with a steamboat. Then, he asked why he was recalled.

³³³ Özkaya... [et al.]; Ibid., pp. 179-180.

³³⁴ Özkaya... [et al.]; Ibid., p. 171.

³³⁵ Salahi R. Sonyel, *Kurtuluş Savaşı Günlerinde İngiliz İstihbarat Servisi'nin Türkiye'deki Eylemleri*, (Ankara: TTK, 1995), p. 18.

³³⁶ The British General Milne sent a note to the Ottoman Ministry of War on June 6, 1919, emphasizing that “travel of an elite general like Mustafa Kemal in the interior of the country was unnecessary and it was not the proper course of action. He thought that this action would even annoy the public opinion.” So, he firmly requested from the İstanbul Government to call Mustafa Kemal back to İstanbul immediately. Sonyel, Ibid., p. 18.

³³⁷ Sonyel, Ibid., p. 18; Aydoğan, *Samsun'dan Erzurum'a...* pp. 29-30.

Şevket Turgut Pasha replied that the government had decided on it. However, the Chief of General Staff Cevad Pasha confessed that *the British authorities wanted it*.³³⁸ In spite of instruction of the Government, Mustafa Kemal Pasha did not obey this order finding various pretexts; thus, he could stay his post for a while.

The newspapers do not provide information about the activities of Mustafa Kemal Pasha in Samsun because the press focused intensively on the occupation of İzmir by the Greeks and tried to enlighten the people, and give them regular information about what was happening in İzmir and its environment. However, only two newspapers, *Vakit* and *Alemdar*, published news about Mustafa Kemal Pasha. It is interesting that *Vakit* reported the dismissal of Mustafa Kemal Pasha from his post. The paper presented it as a common internal news: “A report had been received that Mustafa Kemal Pasha, who had been appointed to the Inspectorate of the Eastern Troops, was dismissed from his position.”³³⁹ Other newspapers do not share this news or like this. Most probably, *Vakit* published this news by the virtue of the fact that Şevket Turgut Pasha wanted Mustafa Kemal Pasha to come back to İstanbul. That is, the newspaper attributed the recall of him to discharging of his position.

As for the other news published in *Alemdar* on June 12, 1919, this one refused the claims in *Vakit*. *Alemdar* denied the news mentioned above as follows: “Although some of the newspapers had written yesterday that Mustafa Kemal Pasha, who had been assigned to the Ninth Army Inspectorate, was resigned, we declare that it is certainly unfounded.”³⁴⁰ This news was not published in the other newspapers. There was no news about Mustafa Kemal Pasha, except for these two.

³³⁸ “Zat-ı alileri gibi kıymetli bir generalin hemen Anadolu vilayetlerinde dolaşmasının efkâr-ı umumiyeye iyi bir tesir bahşedemeyeceğinden bahisle İstanbul’a celp buyurulmanızı İngilizler istedi.” Atatürk, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 20; Jaeschke, *Ibid.*, pp. 41-42.

³³⁹ *Vakit*, No.583, 11 Haziran 1335 [11.06.1919], p. 1.

³⁴⁰ “Dokuzuncu Ordu Müfettişliğine tayin edilmiş olan Mustafa Kemal Paşa'nın istifa ettiğini dünkü gazetelerden bazıları yazmışsa da bunun katiyyen asılsız olduğunu beyan ederiz.” *Alemdar*, No.181-1491, 22 Haziran 1335 [12.06.1919], p. 2.

3.1.4.1. The Amasya Circular and its Political and Legal Importance

As it was mentioned earlier that Mustafa Kemal Pasha had contact with Kazım Pasha immediately after he arrived in Samsun. Kazım Karabekir Pasha was also taking some important steps in the name of national resistance organization in Eastern Anatolia at that time.³⁴¹ Mustafa Kemal Pasha sent a letter, on June 11, to him and he stated his wishes for working with the nation to save the independence of the nation together. Kazım Karabekir also replied this letter positively and expressed his support to this decision.³⁴² Mustafa Kemal Pasha had stayed in Havza between the dates of May 25 – June 13, 1919. Predicting a stiffer British attitude, Mustafa Kemal moved to remoter and safer city of Amasya on June 13, 1919. Mustafa Kemal and his friends were met by Tevfik Efendi, Mufti of Amasya, and the some notables of the city, and they declared their loyalty. Hacı Tevfik Efendi said that: ‘‘Pasha, Amasya is entirely at your command. May Your Holy War (Gaza) is blessed...’’³⁴³ It was the first time that Mustafa Kemal received public and official support from a powerful religious authority. Here, Mustafa Kemal delivered a speech to the citizens, announcing the start of a national resistance:

Citizens of Amasya! What are you waiting for? ... Citizens of Amasya! If the enemy tries to land in Samsun, we must pull on our peasants shoes, we must withdraw to the mountains, we must defend the country to the last rock. If it is the will of God that we be defeated, we must set fire to all our homes, to all our homes, to all our property; we must lay the country in ruins and leave it an empty desert. Citizens of Amasya! Let us all together swear an oath that we shall do this.³⁴⁴

These words remarked that for Mustafa Kemal, time had come to gather his friends and proceed to serious action. Meanwhile, Mustafa Kemal received a telegram from Ali Fuat (Cebesoy) Pasha, who was the head of the Twentieth Army Corps in Ankara. He announced that Rauf (Orbay) Bey and other two friends had arrived

³⁴¹ Andrew Mango, *Atatürk*, (London: John Murray, 2004), p. 238.

³⁴² Atatürk'ün Tamim, Telgraf ve Beyannameleri, p. 31; Karabekir, *İstiklal Harbimiz*, Vol. I, pp. 173-174.

³⁴³ Ömer Turan, ‘‘Milli Mücadele'nin Lehine Kamuoyu Oluşumunda Din Adamları’’, *AAMD*, Vol. XV, No. 45 (1999), p. 825.

³⁴⁴ Şevket Süreyya Aydemir, *Tek Adam: Mustafa Kemal (1919-1922)*, Vol. II, (İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 2006), p. 41; Kinross, *Ibid.*, p. 170.

Ankara, and suggested a meeting.³⁴⁵ Mustafa Kemal replied that he could not himself move from Havza region owing to lack of gasoline. Instead he asked them to come to Amasya, suggesting that they should travel in disguise and not divulge their names, on June 19, 1919.³⁴⁶

Mustafa Kemal had a meeting with Ali Fuat Pasha, Rauf Bey and the others in Amasya. Refet (Bele) Pasha joined them later. Mustafa Kemal and his friends discussed about the miserable situation of the country throughout the night. At the end of the meeting, a text of circular called the Amasya Circular, dictated by Cevat Abbas (Gürer), emerged. Mustafa Kemal Pasha, Ali Fuat Pasha, Rauf Bey and Refet Pasha approved and signed the Circular in the night of June 21-22, 1919.³⁴⁷ After signing, Mustafa Kemal and his friends came into contact with Kazım Karabekir Pasha, Mersinli Cemal Pasha and Cafer Tayyar (Eğilmez) Pasha, who could not attend the meeting. They sent the contents of the Circular to them. Kazım Karabekir and Cemal Pasha gave it their approval. However, Kazım Karabekir Pasha wanted that Mustafa Kemal Pasha and Rauf Bey should come to Erzurum and participate in the Erzurum Congress, which prepared by himself and SDR of Eastern Anatolia (Society of Defense for National Rights of Eastern Anatolia).³⁴⁸ After the draft of Amasya Circular had been approved, the final form was declared and also sent to the official and military authorities in Anatolia.³⁴⁹ In addition to these,

³⁴⁵ One of three people who came with Rauf Bey were former Mutasarrıf of İzmit Süreyya (Yiğit) Bey. The other person was Captain Osman (Tufan) Bey. He Bey was useful in the liberation of Adana and found fame in the name of "Captain Tufan" and participated in the Commander-in-Chief War of War with the title of regiment commander. The last person was Reserve Officer from Indian Abdurrahman. He was a soldier who voluntarily fought in the Turkish army since the Balkan Wars. Cebesoy, *Ibid.*, p. 66.

³⁴⁶ Atatürk, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 22-23; Özkaya... [et al.]; *Ibid.*, p. 181; Kinross, *Ibid.*, p. 169.

³⁴⁷ Mango, *Ibid.*, p. 230; Kinross, *Ibid.*, p. 169.

³⁴⁸ Aydoğan, *Samsun'dan Erzurum'a...* pp. 101-102; Mango, *Ibid.*, p. 230; Kinross, *Ibid.*, p. 171. Kazım Karabekir Pasha said that he would gather Erzurum Congress before the Sivas Congress and he asked Mustafa Kemal and Rauf Bey to come to Erzurum and to attend this congress. Mustafa Kemal and Rauf Bey had accepted this request, but for the first time, a difference of opinion was appeared among the commanders. Mustafa Kemal Pasha said about Kazım Karabekir Pasha: "I had expected to get such an answer from Erzurum. I was not wrong. When I saw him in İstanbul, he had mentioned that the establishment of a resistance center in Erzurum by uniting the organizations which were gathered under various names in the East and the principles of a national Turkish government had to be established here again." According to Ali Fuat Pasha, Mustafa Kemal Pasha was considering like that: "Dividing the country as East and West is not right. Homeland should be considered as a whole. General remedies for salvation should be sought." Cebesoy, *Ibid.*, pp. 72-73.

³⁴⁹ Tansel, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 15.

Mustafa Kemal Pasha sent a copy of the Amasya Circular with an accompanying letter to a number of political personalities in İstanbul, who sympathized with the national cause. Mustafa Kemal attracted their attentions on that the protest meetings and similar demonstrations could never attain the realization of great aims by themselves alone and they had to rely on the strength of the nation.³⁵⁰ He, in a sense, wanted to take the pulse of İstanbul and to gain the support of these people for the national resistance.

The Amasya Circular, which Kinross described as *Declaration of Independence*³⁵¹ and Ali Fuat Pasha described as *Sacred Alliance*³⁵², covered following significant points: The integrity of the country and the independence of the nation were in danger. The capital of the country was under the Allied occupation and the Government subject itself to foreign control, hence incapable of administrating. The nation had to save itself by its own will-power. Its determination to resist foreign domination had been proved by the rise of the various defence organizations. These had to be co-ordinated into a central national body, capable of judging needs of the nation and voicing its demands, free from outside influence. Thus, a National Congress in Sivas, where the safest place in Anatolia, should be convened immediately. The place and date of it would be kept secret.³⁵³

It can be inferred from the main principles that the Amasya Circular is very important document in terms of both political and legal process of the National Struggle. For political perspective, first of all, the phase of action of the Turkish revolution started with this circular, and also the National Struggle based on national sovereignty and national independence emerged as a “Movement of Revolt”³⁵⁴

³⁵⁰ The letter was forwarded those persons: “Abdurrahman Şeref Bey, Reşit Akif Paşa, Ahmet İzzet Paşa, Seyit Bey, Halide Edip Hanım, Kara Vasıf Bey, Ferid Bey (Minister of Public Works), Ferid Pasha, the leader of the ‘Peace and Salvation’ Party and who was subsequently Minister of War, Cami Bey and Ahmet Rıza Bey. Atatürk, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 24-25; Akşin, *Ibid.*, p. Vol. I, p. 33; Mango, *Ibid.*, p. 231.

³⁵¹ Kinross, *Ibid.*, p. 171.

³⁵² Cebesoy, *Ibid.*, p. 76.

³⁵³ For further information, See Türk İstiklal Harbi, Vol. II, Chapter I, pp. 116-117; Akşin, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 425-426; Kinross, *Ibid.*, p. 171.

³⁵⁴ Sabahattin Selek has referred to those who were in Amasya and those who accepted the Amasya Circular as the “Revolutionary Committee”. According to him, the period from Samsun to Amasya was passed by the preparations of the manifesto of the revolution. During this period, the purpose

against the injustice. In this sense, the Circular is a declaration of revolution started in Anatolia. As it was remarked in the first article of the Circular, the target of the National movement was to provide the indivisible integrity of the homeland with its territory and nation and to ensure the independence of the nation.

Moreover, it is clearly seen that the Amasya Circular envisaged a new order based on the national sovereignty rather than dashed old order, in which some anti-nationalist politicians, writers, and officials wanted to maintain in cooperation with the invaders. The principle of national sovereignty based on will of the nation³⁵⁵ constituted the power of this new order and even the *independence* was the slogan of it. From this perspective, the Circular can be considered as a reaction against the Allied powers because it even opposed the implementation of the Mondros Armistice.

The Amasya Circular played a significant role in unifying the nation around the idea of independence. Moreover, the decisions tried to connect many separate and regional attempts to a national committee.³⁵⁶ The main reason of such an attempt of forming national committee stemmed from incapable of the Government to perform its responsibility against the occupations. With regard to this, the Amasya Circular planned to convene a congress in Sivas with the opportunity of using the executive power; and thus, the Nationalists could replace the central Government by forming a national committee. This decision actually indicated that Nationalists wanted to establish a new government in Anatolia.³⁵⁷ Even if the idea of forming a new government was not stated explicitly, it can be noticed in the spirit of in the decisions taken in Amasya. In fact, it can be asserted that the basis of a new government in Anatolia was firstly founded in Amasya.³⁵⁸

In addition to political importance, the Amasya Circular was also very important document from the legal point of view. This Circular, which was considered “the

of Mustafa Kemal Pasha was to prepare for the Anatolian Revolution by making contact and correspondences with the Army commanders. Selek, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 269.

³⁵⁵ Aydoğan, *Samsun'dan Erzurum'a...*, p. 108.

³⁵⁶ Cebesoy, *Ibid.*, p. 76.

³⁵⁷ Hamza Eroğlu, *Türk İnkılap Tarihi*, (İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1982), p. 179-183. Also, Kinross said that “it was clear to all that the declaration went further than the mere organization of the defence of country. It envisaged the possible formation, by the Sivas Congress, of a national Government, independent of İstanbul.” Kinross, *Ibid.*, p. 171.

³⁵⁸ Aydemir, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 44-45.

transition of the idea into action, had originality in Turkish history because it prompted the using of the national will that the Turkish people had not accustomed to, in a way, politicization of it.³⁵⁹ Accordingly, the Circular put forward the basic principle of “national sovereignty” against the absolute authority of the Caliph-Sultan. That is, this document had a meaning of opposition to the Sultan and disregard of the Sultanate.³⁶⁰ Moreover, the Circular emphasized that the nation must save itself by its own will-power. It was its main method to resist foreign domination. In this way, the national will and independence had gained value by writing down on the legal documents.³⁶¹

It is necessary to express that the Amasya Circular was not published in any of the newspapers in İstanbul and Anatolia. In this period, the İstanbul press mostly published news about the occupation of İzmir, the prosecution of war criminals, and Paris Peace Conference, which was held on January 18, 1919 – January 21, 1920. In fact, the press started to focus on mainly the peace talks since the invitation of Grand Vizier Damat Ferid to the Conference on May 30, 1919, via DeFrance, French High Commissioner. As for Anatolian press, they ignored the activities of the Nationalists. Actually, the Anatolian periodicals were not yet able to grasp the inner face of the nationalist developments in Anatolia. However, the Anatolian press would become influential after the mid of September 1919.

The declaration of the Circular with such important decisions caused to the reaction of the İstanbul Government. Because of the pressure of the British officers, Ali Kemal, *Minister of Internal Affairs*, issued a proclamation, which prohibited the movement of the National Forces, and sent it to all provinces on June 18, 1919.³⁶² Some of nationalist and anti-nationalist newspaper like *Hadisat* and *Vakit*, and *Alemdar* gave coverage to this proclamation in their issues dated on June 23, 1919. These papers did not make any comment on the proclamation, they just published it as “the Proclamation of Ministry of Internal Affairs”. The content of the proclamation generally covered the instructions that: using political channels for

³⁵⁹ İhsan Ezherli, *Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi (1920-1992) ve Osmanlı Meclis-i Mebusanı (1877-1920)*, (Ankara: TBMM Basımevi, 1992), p. 6; Aydoğan, *Samsun’dan Erzurum’a...*, p. 106.

³⁶⁰ Ezherli, *Ibid.*, p. 6; Eroğlu, *Ibid.*, p. 183.

³⁶¹ Kinross, *Ibid.*, p. 171; Eroğlu, *Ibid.*, p. 184.

³⁶² Jaeschke, *Ibid.*, p. 45; Eroğlu, *Ibid.*, p. 185.

saving the country, disbanding national organizations, and avoiding any attempts to irritate the Allies. Ali Kemal added that:

However sad the Ottoman Government is for the occupations, which were contrary to all kinds of laws and performed violently, it is not in a position to fight at the moment. It can defend itself using only political tools and fortunately, the hopes of our representatives in the Conference will be able to provide the integrity of the homeland increase day by day. It is a catastrophe to prevent such a hopeful consequence by forming *the national forces* and *national defense*. ...Disruption of general public order, sowing discord among among public elements, loss of the satisfaction of representatives of the Allies, and making attempts of banditry and plunder, God forbidden, may lead to the loss of our case before the Peace Conference.³⁶³

As it is clearly indicated that Ali Kemal – in fact the İstanbul Government - was opposed to be formed the national movements and organizations and it wanted to be prevented such formations.

In the same day, Ali Kemal sent a secret proclamation to all provinces, saying that Mustafa Kemal was dismissed his official duty of Inspectorate since he disobeyed the order of recall to İstanbul. Also, Ali Kemal directed that no one had official correspondence with Mustafa Kemal and that his instructions should not be implemented because he did not have an official title. Otherwise, according to the proclamation of Ali Kemal, those officials and army officers would be also considered guilty and they would be severely punished. According to thoughts of Ali Kemal, “this great cause could not be achieved by fighting and pounding.” (Harp ve darp ile bu müthiş dava kazanılamaz).³⁶⁴

In addition to the proclamation of the Government against the national organization, Ali Kemal made a statement to the French press on the issue of forming of the national organizations in Anatolia. This statement was also published in the Nationalist newspapers *İkdam* and *Sabah*, and the anti-Nationalist paper, *Alemdar*.

³⁶³ *Hadisat* No.174, 23 Haziran 1335 [23.06.1919], p. 1; *Vakit*, No.595, 23 Haziran 1335 [23.06.1919], p. 1; *Alemdar*, No.182-1492, 23 Haziran 1335 [23.06.1919], p. 1.

³⁶⁴ However, Mustafa Kemal reminded the government that he had been appointed as an army inspector by the Sultan himself and emphasized that he had continued his duty until he was dismissed from his post by the Sultan himself. Thus, Mustafa Kemal Pasha decided to continue his post regardless of the orders of the Government. Atatürk, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 25; Akşin, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 248; Sarıhan, *Kurtuluş Savaşı'nda İkili...*, p. 85.

The first part of the statement was censored. In the second part, Ali Kemal evaluated the developments in Anatolia as follows:

Unfortunately, the Greeks are not the only ones who undermined interrupt our endeavours. All of our enemies are not outside. There are also those inside, and they are not less dangerous: These are the unionists. They make use of every opportunity to fish in troubled waters. They aggravate the people. Also, the unionists seek a way to take advantage of the confusion caused by the Greek occupation in order to satisfy their desire and to vent their suppressed animosity. They are not concerned with the interests of the country. They act only for their personal interests. Moreover, the unionists look for a base in the lowest stratum of society and and they drag this stratum, which is available for everything. With a method that is important to them, they form the gangs, which plunder and kill.³⁶⁵

It is understood from the statement, also published in *İkdam*, Sabah and Almedar that Ali Kemal attributed the developments in Anatolia to the efforts of the unionists and described the Nationalists as unionist. According to the expressions of Ali Kemal, the Nationalists damage the country by forming national organizations. Also, he claimed that they were “more dangerous enemies than the Greeks.”

3.1.4.2. The Erzurum Congress and The Resignation of Mustafa Kemal Pasha

As it was determined in the Amasya Circular, Mustafa Kemal Pasha planned to hold a national congress in Sivas, which he regarded as the safest city in Anatolia. On the other hand, he had to go Erzurum upon the invitation of Kazım Karabekir, so as to attend the Erzurum Congress. Meanwhile, Mustafa Kemal received warnings of probable threat in Sivas, where he planned to continue his way to the Erzurum Congress. The İstanbul Government, particularly *Ministry of the Internal Affairs*, wanted to diminish his prestige and influence in the eyes of public.³⁶⁶ Mustafa Kemal and Rauf Bey left secretly Amasya morning at daybreak on June 26, 1919, without notice of anyone. They drove up the valley of Yeşilirmak to Tokat, a small town enveloped by rockbound fortress. Then, they immediately took the control of the telegraph office in order to ensure that their arrival should not be announced to Sivas. Before leaving for Sivas, six hours' journey, Mustafa Kemal issued a telegraph to

³⁶⁵ *Alemdar*, No.185-1495, 26 Haziran 1335 [26.06.1919], p. 1; *İkdam*, No.8039, 26 Haziran 1335 [26.06.1919], p. 1; *Sabah*, No.10638, 26 Haziran 1335 [26.06.1919], p. 1. From *L'Entent*.

³⁶⁶ Özkaya... [et al.]; *Ibid.*, p. 185.

Reşit Pasha, the Governor of Sivas, informing their arrival. However, he ordered that it should be forwarded only six hours after his departure.³⁶⁷ They hoped to nullify the plot prepared by the İstanbul Government to arrest Mustafa Kemal Pasha and prevent the Congress.

For this plot, Ali Galip,³⁶⁸ a retired Staff Colonel, had been assigned by the Government and sent to Sivas. Meanwhile, Mustafa Kemal and Rauf Bey arrived Sivas on June 27, 1919. The Governor Reşit Pasha met them and Mustafa Kemal got him in his open car and made him sit by his side. They continued to drive towards the city. The news of their arrival spread and the interested crowd and troops greeted them. Ali Galip did not take any measures and the attempt to arrest Mustafa Kemal was effectively nullified. Then, Mustafa Kemal reprimanded him and branded him as a traitor to his country. Also, Mustafa Kemal delivered a long speech, explaining the principles of National movement.³⁶⁹ After giving the necessary instructions for the preparation of the National congress, he left for Erzurum.

Mustafa Kemal arrived to Erzurum on July 3, 1919. Kazım Karabekir Pasha, his staff officers, Ahmet Münir Bey, *the previous Governor of Erzurum*, Raif Efendi, *the Chief of SDR of Erzurum*, and other people received Mustafa Kemal and his entourage with open arms. The next day, Mustafa Kemal wore his uniform, Adjutancy Braid, and all medals, and visited the building of SDR of Erzurum together with Rauf Bey and İbrahim Sürayya Bey. They talked about preparations for Erzurum Congress and evaluated the current situation approximately two hours.³⁷⁰

Meanwhile, according to the news from the press, İstanbul was still waiting for Mustafa Kemal Pasha to come back although he persisted in his refusal to return. For instance, anti-nationalist newspaper, *Türkçe İstanbul* reported on July 4, 1919, that “Mustafa Kemal is going from Sivas to Samsun and he will depart from there

³⁶⁷ Kinross, *Ibid.*, p. 172.

³⁶⁸ Ali Galip had posted bills on the walls, proclaiming Mustafa Kemal “a dangerous man, a mutineer, a traitor” and urged the Governor Reşit Pasha to arrest him in terms of the order of the Ministry of the Internal Affairs.” For further information about the activities of Ali Galip and his attempts to arrest Mustafa Kemal, See Atatürk, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 27; Kinross, *Ibid.*, p. 172.

³⁶⁹ Özkaya... [et al.]; *Ibid.*, p. 186; Eroğlu, *Ibid.*, p. 186; Tansel, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 27.

³⁷⁰ Cevat Dursunoğlu, *Milli Mücadelede Erzurum*, (Ankara: [s.n.], 1946), pp. 89-91.

towards Trabzon.”³⁷¹ In news published in nationalist journal *İstiklal*, reporter asked: “Will Mustafa Kemal return?” Etem Bey, *the Vice Chairman of Ministry of Internal Affairs*, replied this question as follows: “He did not rebel and it does not seem strange his compliance with the invitation of the Government. He had never been informed of his dismissal before. The delay in his return stems from this.”³⁷² However, the next day, a nationalist journal, *Vakit* wrote that the statement of the Vice Chairman of Ministry about Mustafa Kemal Pasha had not been confirmed.³⁷³ Lastly, Fevzi Pasha, *Undersecretary of the Ministry of War*, who made a statement to the *Vakit* on July 9, said that “the instruction of return was announced to Mustafa Kemal Pasha. He will come to İstanbul through Azerbaijan, Yerevan, Batum.”³⁷⁴

Upon refusal of Mustafa Kemal to relinquish his post, the Imperial Decree was issued on July 8, 1919, and he was discharged from his official duty.³⁷⁵ In response to this decision, Mustafa Kemal sent a telegraph to Sultan Vahdeddin saying that he resigned his official post and his commission in the army. Henceforward, Mustafa Kemal Pasha fought to achieve as an individual, free from any official rank and restriction. He trusted solely to the benevolence and magnanimity of the nation itself and drew his strength, energy and inspiration from the nation, as an inexhaustible spring.³⁷⁶ Mustafa Kemal, on July 8, 1919 at night, also issued the following declaration for the nation and the army: “I present and declare that I will continue to serve as a simple individual of the nation in order to keep my country and the nation

³⁷¹ *Türkçe İstanbul*, 4 Temmuz 1335 [4.07.1919], p. 1. The İstanbul Government had sent its first order to Mustafa Kemal about his return to İstanbul on June 8, 1919. The War Minister of İstanbul Government, who was trying to prevent the activities of Mustafa Kemal related to the National Resistance, again recalled him to İstanbul in the behalf of the Sultan on July 5, 1919. Mustafa Kemal disobeyed the instruction of the Government and he, on the same day, issued a circular ordering that the communication centers should be controlled in order to stop the possible negative declaration of the İstanbul Government. See Jaeschke, *Ibid.*, p. 48.

³⁷² *İstiklal*, July 6, 1919, p. 1.

³⁷³ *Vakit*, No.607, 7 Temmuz 1335 [07.07.1919], p. 1.

³⁷⁴ *Vakit*, No.609, 9 Temmuz 1335 [09.07.1919], p. 1.

³⁷⁵ *TV*, 8 Temmuz 1335 [8.07.1919], p. 1. *Atatürk İle İlgili Arşiv Belgeleri*, pp. 51-52. On July 9, 1919, the Ministry of Internal Affairs informed that Mustafa Kemal Pasha had been dismissed and that it was not correct to act together with him. Also, the Ministry asked from commanders of the Third, Thirteenth, and Fifteenth Army Corps to contact directly with the Ministry. Tansel, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 41.

³⁷⁶ Atatürk, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 33; Eroğlu, *Ibid.*, p. 187.

from falling apart and in order not to be sacrificed the country for Greek and Armenian desires.’’³⁷⁷

The inevitable resignation of Mustafa Kemal Pasha and his future were interpreted differently in İstanbul and Anatolian press. For example, *Vakit* in İstanbul published a news sharing information that ‘‘Mustafa Kemal Pasha, Inspector of the Eastern Troops, resigned from his military service. He will spend the rest of his life in a remote corner of Anatolia.’’³⁷⁸ Similar news published on July 14, 1919 in *Albayrak*, the media organ of SDR of Erzurum. The newspaper wrote about his resignation as follows:

The resignation of Mustafa Kemal Pasha is a sign of determination and faith. It is a great proof that the old blood of the nation has not yet faded.The nation gathered around Mustafa Kemal Pasha, who has determinedly and faithfully devoted his body to defend the right of homeland, constitutes an immaculate, pure, and bright halo. It is doubtless that such holy elements as the liberty and independence will emerge from such a combination of clean and self-sacrificial souls. Perseverance and faith are enough to achieve challenges.³⁷⁹

After Mustafa Kemal Pasha had resigned from the army, other leaders like Kazım Karabekir, Rauf Bey and Refet Pasha tried to reassure him and their affection and respect for him increased. Especially Kazım Karabekir and his troop reassured Mustafa Kemal Pasha that he was still their honoured commander, as he was in the past. They expressed that they were, all of them, at his command. As soon as Mustafa Kemal resigned from his post, the SDR of Erzurum elected him as the chairman of the executive committee and Rauf was elected vice-chairman.³⁸⁰ Hence, Mustafa Kemal and his friends focused on the preparations of the Ezurum Congress.

Before Mustafa Kemal Pasha arrived in Erzurum, Kazım Karabekir had already started the preparations for the congress. Ultimately, the Erzurum Congress was convened in the hall of a school building on July 23, 1919, with the participation of fifty-four delegates from the provinces of Bitlis, Erzurum, Sivas, Trabzon and

³⁷⁷ Atatürk'ün Tamim, Telgraf ve Beyannameleri, p. 54.

³⁷⁸ *Vakit*, No.612, 12 Temmuz 1335 [12.07.1919], p. 1.

³⁷⁹ *Albayrak*, No.17, 14 Temmuz 1335 [14.07.1919], p. 1.

³⁸⁰ Haluk Selvi, *Milli Mücadelede Erzurum (1918 – 1923)*, (Ankara: AAMY, 2000), p. 98.

Van.³⁸¹ Although the delegates had been elected to represent the other provinces of eastern Anatolia, such as Elazığ, Mardin and Diyarbakır, they were prevented from attending by the provincial administrators.³⁸²

One of the most controversial issues in the meeting was related to forming a representative committee and electing the chairman of this committee. Mustafa Kemal Pasha runs for the presidency of the committee. Ultimately, the delegates formed the “Representative Committee” (Heyet-i Temsiliye) with nine people and despite some opposition, elected Mustafa Kemal as their chairman.³⁸³ Having been elected the Chairman, Mustafa Kemal Pasha, who had been gradeless and unauthorized before the Congress, had official position once more, but as a civil person.

While the Congress carried on its works, the İstanbul Government ordered to Kazım Karabekir Pasha on July 30, 1919, to detain both Mustafa Kemal Pasha and Rauf Bey and send them back to İstanbul.³⁸⁴ On the other hand, Kazım Karabekir Pasha ignored the instruction of the İstanbul Government, which wanted to nip the National movement in the bud, and he supported Mustafa Kemal Pasha by saying “Pasha, my army corps and me are at your command.” The act and decision of Kazım Karabekir was probably one of the most important turning points, even the biggest base of the National Struggle.³⁸⁵ It was clear example that the aggressive policy of İstanbul against the Nationalists enabled them to consolidate the unity and solidarity in way of National Resistance.

Around these days, the press gave wide coverage to the interesting news about return and arrest of Mustafa Kemal Pasha and Rauf Bey. For example, Some nationalist newspapers dated on August 2-3, 1919, published a statement of Adil Bey, the new

³⁸¹ Karabekir, *İstiklal Harbimiz*, Vol. I, p. 240. Cevat Dursunoğlu and Major Kazım Pasha resigned delegation of the Erzurum Congress and gave up their seats to Mustafa Kemal Pasha and Rauf Bey. Dursunoğlu, *Ibid.*, pp. 98-99.

³⁸² İnan, *Ibid.*, p. 33.

³⁸³ Selvi, *Milli Mücadele’de Erzurum...*p. 109; İnan, *Ibid.*, p. 34. The names of the members in the Representative Committee as follows: Mustafa Kemal Pasha, Rauf Bey, Raif Efendi, İzzet Bey, Servet Bey, Şeyh Fevzi Efendi, Bekir Sami Bey, Sadullah Efendi, Hacı Musa Bey. Tansel, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 60.

³⁸⁴ Karabekir, *İstiklal Harbimiz*, Vol. I, p. 270; *Atatürk İle İlgili Arşiv Belgeleri*, pp. 53-54.

³⁸⁵ Suna Kili, *Türk Devrim Tarihi*, (İstanbul: TİBKY, 2008), pp. 38-39. “It was a fateful moment in the history of both Mustafa Kemal and the National Struggle” Aydemir, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 106.

Minister of Internal Affairs after Ali Kemal, in their columns. This statement strongly criticized Mustafa Kemal and Rauf: “The end of Mustafa Kemal and Rauf will be like Enver. They do not want to accept the consequences of the defeat of Turkey. The government had decided to act violently against these adventurers.”³⁸⁶ According to another news in *Vakit*, quoted from *Orient News*, published under the British propaganda in İstanbul, the İstanbul Government ordered Mustafa Kemal Pasha and Rauf Bey to be arrested on the grounds of confusion around Erzurum and Bursa. The newspaper, which claimed that the Government waited for a long time, asserted the following thought:

It is doubtful that a result will be obtained from this decision. Anatolia is in a complicated situation today, this is due to the instability and powerless that prevailed after intentional negligence in the beginning. The newspaper also added: ...Ordering to arrest of Mustafa Kemal and Rauf is similar to ordering to arrest of Lenin and Trotsky. Is it possible to arrest Lenin and Trotsky?³⁸⁷

Another nationalist newspaper, *İfham* also shared the statement of Adil Bey in its issue dated on August 3, 1919. The Minister said: “Mustafa Kemal and Rauf Bey disrupt the order. They are setting up gangs. They want to set up a government within the government. They call the people to have illegal meetings by using the password of the Government. We will severely punish them.”³⁸⁸

The anti-nationalist newspapers also shared news about arrest of Mustafa Kemal and Rauf. In this regard, Refi Cevad, the editor of *Alemdar*, stated that “he trusted Mustafa Kemal Pasha and believed him that he would not make a mistake, causing disorder by believing the unionists.” Refi Cevat criticized only Rauf Bey in his article.³⁸⁹ In addition to this, *Türkçe İstanbul* acknowledged that “Mustafa Kemal was a great soldier, but it claimed that he was pursuing adventure and asserted that Mustafa Kemal intervened in the business of the Government since his departure moving to Samsun.”³⁹⁰ This news was censored because of using the phrase “a

³⁸⁶ *İfham*, No.11, 2 Ağustos 1335 [02.08.1919], p. 1; *İkdam*, No.8075, 2 Ağustos 1335 [02.08.1919], p. 1; *Vakit*, No.634, 2 Ağustos 1335 [02.08.1919], p. 1.

³⁸⁷ *Vakit*, No. 634 2 Ağustos 1335 [02.08.1919], p. 1. From *The Orient News*.

³⁸⁸ *İfham*, No.12, 3 Ağustos 1335 [03.08.1919], p. 1. Also See *Tasvir-i Efkâr*, No.2801, 3 Ağustos 1335 [03.08.1919], p. 1; *Vakit*, No. 635, 3 Ağustos 1335 [03.08.1919], p. 1.

³⁸⁹ *Alemdar*, No.131-1531, 1 Ağustos 1335 [01.08.1919], p. 1.

³⁹⁰ *Türkçe İstanbul*, No.249, 6 Ağustos 1335 [06.08.1919], p. 1. For the same article, See *Alemdar*, No.135-1535, 7 Ağustos 1335 [07.08.1919], p. 1.

great soldier” for Mustafa Kemal; however, the article was entirely against Mustafa Kemal Pasha and his doings. It was able to be published on August 6, 1919. Around these times, Abdullah Pasha, one of the former war ministers, was appointed as the inspector instead of Mustafa Kemal.³⁹¹ The Government started to believe that the case of Mustafa Kemal had been resolved with this appointment. It can be understood from news published in *Türkçe İstanbul*: “It was declared by the relevant authority that the case of Mustafa Kemal Pasha lost its significance aso that Abdullah Pasha had been appointed instead of him.”³⁹²

Even though Mustafa Kemal resigned from military service, he continued to encourage the people to form national organizations in Anatolia and resist against the occupations. For this reason, he was dismissed from the military profession. Also, the Government revoked his Honorary Adjutant rank and decorations with an Imperial Decree on August 9, 1919.³⁹³ Instead of assigning new one, Sultan Vahdettin approved the Decree, abolishing the Inspectorates of the First, Second, and Third Army, on August 16, 1919.³⁹⁴

It is possible to see news about the removal of Mustafa Kemal from his military service in both nationalist and anti-nationalist newspapers. For example, *Akşam*, one of the nationalist and influential newspapers in İstanbul, narrated the news like that:

According to the official newspaper, *Takvim-i Vekayi*, dated August 12, 1919, Mustafa Kemal “Bey”, who had been dismissed from the Third Army Inspectorate and had resigned from military service, was discharged from the army and his military decorations and rank of Honorary Adjutancy were revoked.³⁹⁵

It was known that Mustafa Kemal Pasha had resigned his post and military service on July 8, 1919. Most probably, the newspaper did not use title “Pasha” for Mustafa Kemal because of his resignation.

³⁹¹ *İfham*, No.15, 6 Ağustos 1335 [06.08.1919], p. 1. Although Abdullah Pasha had been appointed instead of Mustafa Kemal, he could not go to his post and had to resign on August 14, 1919. *İkdam*, No.8086, 15 Ağustos 1335 [15.08.1919], p. 1.

³⁹² *Türkçe İstanbul*, No.251 8 Ağustos 1335 [86.08.1919], p. 1.

³⁹³ *Atatürk İle İlgili Arşiv Belgeleri*, pp. 56-57.

³⁹⁴ *TV*, No.3625, 16 Ağustos 1335 [16.08.1919], p. 1.

³⁹⁵ *Akşam*, No.321, 12 Ağustos 1335 [12.08.1919], p. 2.

Another nationalist newspaper *İkdam* announced the removal of Mustafa Kemal as follows: “Mustafa Kemal Pasha, appointed to the army inspectors, caused confusion in Anatolia under the name of the National movement and made some requests based on the resolutions of the Congress held in Erzurum, which put the Central Government in an awkward position. It was decided that Mustafa Kemal Pasha should be removed from his military service and that his decorations and rank of Honorary Adjutancy should be revoked because of his actions, which require punishment. The decision was ratified by the Sultan yesterday.”³⁹⁶

The press dwelled on this event and Ali Kemal in *Peyam* reported this news by saying:

Mustafa Kemal was expelled from military service. Mustafa Kemal Pasha, who made provocations under the mask of the National movement and presided at the National Congress in Erzurum, was sentenced with the punishment he deserved. We hope that the Government makes him such an incapacitated person that he cannot incite the people.³⁹⁷

It is clearly seen from aforementioned news that the leading figures of the National Struggle, mainly Mustafa Kemal Pasha, did not hesitate to show clearly their oppositions to İstanbul. Even though the İstanbul Government followed rigid policy against the Nationalists, in fact, the Government was obliged to take them and their activities into consideration. Moreover, the incapability of the Government to arrest these two officers explicitly proved that it had no authority over Anatolia. As it was indicated in the news, the Government still continued to describe the Nationalists as followers of unionists.

The Erzurum Congress lasted fourteen days and ended on August 7, 1919. In the same day, the decisions of the congress were reproduced in the printing press and

³⁹⁶ “Ordu Müfettişliğine tayin olunduğu halde Anadolu’da Harekât-ı Milliye namı altında iğtişaşkarane hadiseler tevli ve Erzurum’da akdelediği kongre kararıyla bazı metalibatta bulunmak suretiyle hükümet-i merkeziyeyi müşkil bir vaziyet-i siyasiyeye ilkaya sebebiyet veren Mustafa Kemal Paşa’nın harekât-ı vakı’ası müstelzim mücazat-ı ahvalden bulunduğu cihetle kendisinin silk-i askeriyeden tardı ile hamil olduğu nişanların istirdadı ve haiz olduğu fahri yaverlik rütbesinin nez’i hususuna karar verilmiş ve arz-ı atabe-i ulya kılınan karar dün tasdik-i ali-i hazret-i padişahiye iktiran etmiştir.” *İkdam*, No.8083, 12 Ağustos 1335 [12.08.1919], p. 1.

³⁹⁷ “Mustafa Kemal, askerlikten tard edildi. Harekat-ı Milliye perdesi altında tahriklerde bulunan ve Erzurum’da milli kongreye riyaset eden Mustafa Kemal Paşa, müstehak olduğu cezaya uğradı. Ümit ediyoruz ki, hükümet yakında kendisini tahriklere muktedir olamayacak bir hale getirir.” *Peyam*, No. 254-12, 13 Ağustos 1335 [13.08.1919], p. 2.

reported to the army corps by means of telegrams. *Albayrak*, which was the media organ of SDR in Erzurum, published the declaration of the Congress by emphasizing its importance in terms of the goal of the National Resistance. The newspaper published them under the title of *The Nation is on the Road to Defence of Right*. *Albayrak* announced the main principles of this significant declaration as follows:

The entire country within its national frontiers is an indivisible whole. In the event of the Ottoman Empire's disintegration, the nation will unanimously resist any attempt at occupation or intervention by foreigners. If the İstanbul Government is incapable of preserving the independence of the nation and the integrity of the country, an elected provisional Government shall be formed for the purpose of the safeguarding these aims. The main object is to consolidate the National Forces into a ruling factor and to establish the will of the nation as the sovereign power. No privileges, which could impair our political sovereignty or our social equilibrium, shall be granted to non-Turkish minorities. It is out of the question to accept a mandate or protectorate. Everything that is possible shall be done to secure the immediate meeting of the National Assembly.³⁹⁸

After shared these decisions on its columns, *Albayrak* evaluated the current situation of the country and the nation. "The paper, claiming that the nation sought to self defence, strongly criticized Damat Ferid Pasha cabinet and described the Government as the instrument of the nation's enemies. Moreover, the newspaper asserted that the propaganda of Ferid Pasha cabinet was condemned to fail."³⁹⁹

It can be seen that the decisions of the Erzurum Congress and the comments of the newspaper pointed out the unconditional independence and unconditional national sovereignty as the basic discourse of the National movement.

Albyarak continued to give wide coverage to the Erzurum Congress in its columns in order to widen the influence of the Congress throughout Anatolia. The newspaper tried to gather the people around the national organization by elucidating the goals

³⁹⁸ *Albayrak*, No.20, 18 Ağustos 1335 [18.08.1919], p. 1. For further information about the decisions of the Erzurum Congress, See Mahmut Goloğlu, *Erzurum Kongresi*, (İstanbul: TİBKY, 2008), pp. 119-124; Selvi, *Milli Mücadele'de Erzurum...*, pp. 118-119.

³⁹⁹ *Albayrak*, No.20, 18 August 1335 [18.08.1919], p. 1. The reason for criticizing of Grand Vizier Damat Ferid by *Albayrak* was that he was opposed to holding congress. In this regard, he issued another declaration dated on July 20, 1919, and said that "unrest has spread over Anatolia. Contrary to the Constitution, assemblies have been held under the name of the Ottoman Parliament. It is the duty for the military and civil authorities to prevent such attempts." Atatürk, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 46. In response to attack of Damat Ferid, the Nationalists ordered Münir Pasha, the Governor of Erzurum, to inform the Ministry of Internal Affairs that the law and order in the Province of Erzurum was going without any problem. See *İkdam*, No.8064, 23 Temmuz 1335 [23.07.1919], p. 2.

and aims of the Congress. On this point, *Albayrak* published again the main principles of the Erzurum Congress in its issue dated on August 31, 1919, and evaluated the developments as follow:

The Erzurum Congress announced the situation to the world with all its openness. The declaration of the Congress deservedly proved the virtue and pureness of the national cause and the infinite loyalty of the nation to the Caliphate and the Sultanate. For this reason, interpreting the National movement in one form or another may be the act of some stateless persons who are outraged by the sovereignty of the national will and are scared of national unity.⁴⁰⁰

It was indicated in the passage that *Albayrak* tried to eliminate some uncertainties and suspicions about the declaration and Saltanate. It is clear that the newspaper felt the need of explaining that the Nationalists and national organizations were fiercely loyal to the Sultan-Chaliph. In this way, the newspaper showed reaction to the statements of Damat Ferid, who considered the Erzurum Congress as a revolt, by emphasizing their loyalty to the Sultan.⁴⁰¹

There were some journalists who were not pleased with the Erzurum Congress and its principles. For instance, Ali Kemal, the owner and editor of *Sabah*, tried to show the Erzurum Congress as if it was worthless. Also, he argued this Congress contrary to the Ottoman Constitution and declared those who had attended the Congress as rebellious. Ali Kemal continued his claims as follows:

The National Congress in Erzurum, which had been convened by the invitation of Mustafa Kemal Pasha, was concluded on August 7, 1919. Those who had participated in the Congress were made up of a number of unqualified men. Based on the information we had received from an authorized source, we can assure that the Anatolian Muslim people never gave importance to the incitements made.⁴⁰²

As far as it is understood from the manner of Ali Kemal that he tried to imply that the Nationalists and national organizations were not rested on the people. In other

⁴⁰⁰ "Erzurum Kongresi keyfiyeti bütün vuzuhu ile cihana neşr ve ilan etti. Kongre beyannamesi, maksad-ı millinin ulviyyet ve necabetini ve milletin makam-ı hilafet ve saltanata karşı olan layezal merbutiyetini layıkıyla gösterdi. Binaenaleyh harekât-ı milliyeyi şu veya bu tarzda tefsire, iraeeye çalışmak, irade-i milliyenin meşrutiyetinden gözleri kamaşan, ittihad-ı milliden ürken bir takım vatansızların karı olabilir." *Albayrak*, No.24, 31 Ağustos 1335 [31.08.1919], p. 1.

⁴⁰¹ In the aforementioned declaration on July 20, 1919, Damat Ferid described gathering of the Erzurum Congress as a "revolt". According to him, "the Erzurum Congress was contradictory with the provisions of the Ottoman Constitution, the will of the Sultan and the interests of the country." İnan, *Ibid.*, p. 34; Jaeschke, *Ibid.*, p. 52.

⁴⁰² *Sabah*, No.10684, 11 Ağustos 1335 [11.08.1919], p. 1.

words, he asserted that the majority of Turkish people did not support the National movement. Hence, Ali Kemal tried to emphasize that the Nationalists and national organizations were not legitimate authorities.

However, *Albayrak* reacted these kinds of claims and criticized the news published in *Sabah*. In this regard, the newspaper claimed that “the Anatolian movement was born of the conscience of the nation and the nation wanted to show that it cannot be a spectator to those who were not engaged in anything other than sitting in a chair. *Albayrak* also put excessive emphasis on that the National movement was not based on interests of unionists or Freedom and Accord Party, and that those who made propagandism in favour of the people, who had lost the confidence of the nation, would face with the same situation.”⁴⁰³

The people of İstanbul and Anatolia could not be informed in time with decisions of the Erzurum Congress due to the pressures of the İstanbul Government. However, apart from *Albayrak*, some İstanbul and Anatolian newspapers were able to publish news about the Congress even if late. For instance, the nationalist newspaper *Açıksöz*, the media organ of SDR of Katamonu, could give coverage to the declaration of the Erzurum Congress on September 28, 1919. The newspaper wrote that “it is the first congress resolutions signed by the SDR of Eastern Anatolia in Erzurum on July 23 – August 7, 1919, under the name of “the Alliance”. The paper gave the articles of the Congress as full-page news. Moreover, *Açıksöz* also published the program of Representative Committee in its 3rd and 4th pages.⁴⁰⁴ *İkdam* was able to publish the decisions of the Erzurum Congress in İstanbul after the third Damat Ferid cabinet had fallen on October 1, 1919.⁴⁰⁵

In addition to these, *İkdam* and *Peyam* were able to publish important news evaluating the Erzurum Congress and the National movement in general manner. Firstly, *İkdam* shared important news about the Erzurum Congress by quoting from the French press. The news evaluated the Congress as follows:

⁴⁰³ *Albayrak*, No.24, 31 Ağustos 1335 [31.08.1919], p. 1.

⁴⁰⁴ *Açıksöz*, No.14, 28 Eylül 1335 [28.9.1919], p. 2.

⁴⁰⁵ *İkdam*, No.8137, 5 Teşrin-i Evvel 1335 [5.10.1919], p. 1.

Erzurum was far away from the intervention zone of the Allied powers. The city became the new organization center and Mustafa Kemal had convened a congress there with Rauf. In the program determined at this congress, it was planned the establishment of a completely independent state around the Caliphate, which covered the area of above the line from İskenderun Gulf to Mosul. So, if the Peace Conference decided to disintegrate Turkey, it would be necessary to send a strong military force to implement it. America was the only state to carry out this task.⁴⁰⁶

As it is seen that the foreign press inferred from the decisions of the Congress that the Nationalists in Anatolia had decided to establish a new independent state. Also, the news implied that Erzurum was the center of the new state. The newspaper also accepted that the Allied powers had no enough military power to prevent this new formation; thus, it argued that only American state could deal with the Nationalists.

One of the important news published after the Erzurum Congress was issued in *Peyam* on August, 19, 1919. The paper evaluated the Anatolian Resistance in general. The paper emphasized “that whether the people who lead to the Anatolian Resistance would be able to win the Islamic people to their own sides or not, constituted the main problem.” Another noteworthy point is that the Anatolian movement is regarded as “the final of the destruction initiated by the unionists. The newspaper wondered whether this movement originated from patriotic sentiments or from personal interests.” According to the claims in the newspaper, “the National movement will eventually leave nothing else bloody ruins” because Turkey was defeated in the First World War, despite the fact that it gathered two million soldiers and received great assistance from Germany and Austria. Now, it tried to take vengeance of this failure by itself. Moreover, in the following lines of the news, it was claimed that the attitude of the İstanbul Government played a wrong role in the development and spread of the National movement. Additionally, the paper warned that imperialist states should avoid intervening in nationalist developments in Anatolia.⁴⁰⁷

These expressions are very interesting to see what kinds of perception Western public opinion had related to the National Struggle. It is explicitly seen that the newspaper described the leaders of the Anatolian Resistance as the followers of the

⁴⁰⁶ *İkdam*, No.8152, 20 Teşrin-i Evvel 1335 [20.10.1919], p. 2. From *Journal des Debats*.

⁴⁰⁷ *Peyam*, No.260-18, 19 Ağustos 1335 [19.08.1919], p. 2.

Union and Progress and it asserted that the Nationalists would destroy the country as their predecessors.

As concluding remarks, the Erzurum Congress envisaged the unconditional independence and national sovereignty as the spirit of the national liberation. With the help of the Congress, all dispersed “Societies of Defense for Rights in Eastern Anatolia” were merged under the one roof and the authority of the Representative Committee was expanded for entire Eastern Anatolia. Furthermore, when the decisions are carefully analyzed, it can be noticed that the Erzurum Congress adopted important decisions concerning whole of the country even though it had been convened to discuss only the fate of Eastern Anatolia. Briefly, the first core of the National Struggle was formed in the Erzurum Congress.⁴⁰⁸

As it was seen from the news that the Erzurum Congress prompted the press to focus on the developments in Anatolia and newspapers published in İstanbul and Anatolia tried to give wide coverage to news of the National movement despite of pressure of the İstanbul Government. It is also inferred from the publications that the National movement was no longer an “event”, it turned out to be a “fact” in the course of time. Moreover, nationalist newspapers defended the claim that the resignation of Mustafa Kemal Pasha would not diminish his reputation and influence while anti-nationalist newspapers expected that he would retire. Also, nationalist press was hopeful about the national organizations; on the other hand, anti-nationalist press considered the Nationalists as the followers of unionists and described them as gangs that would destroy the country.

3.1.4.3. The Sivas Congress and the Fall of Damat Ferid Cabinet

Mustafa Kemal Pasha successfully concluded the Erzurum Congress and formed the Representative Committee, and he left for Sivas on August 29, and arrived in the evening of September 2, 1919, with his entourage. They were greeted by the people of Sivas and Reşit Pasha, the Governor of Sivas, outside the city. Then, Mustafa

⁴⁰⁸ Selvi, *Milli Mücadele’de Erzurum...*, pp. 119-120; Eroğlu, *Ibid.*, p. 189; Ezherli, *Ibid.*, p. 7.

Kemal and other guests settled in the building that had been allocated to them.⁴⁰⁹ Meanwhile, the delegates were already on their way from different parts of the country.

Although two hundred delegates had been invited, only thirty-eight could come to Sivas. One came from Thrace, Konya, Cilicia (Adana), region of Mesopotamia, and Black Sea coast because of pressure and threatening of the Allies and Greeks. The Congress of Sivas envisaged in the Amasya Circle was convened on September 4, 1919, in the hall of the High School of Sivas at 14.00, with the participation of thirty-eight delegates from eleven provinces, including five members of the Representative Committee.⁴¹⁰ Before the congress started to work, all delegates in the Congress swore an oath that they tried to rescue the homeland and nation, and that the National Forces were not a unionist intrigue. This was also published in *Açıksöz*, the media organ of SDR in Kastamonu, on October 19, 1919. The newspaper narrated the oath as follows:

I will not pursue any personal interest or ambition, but the liberation and peace of my Homeland and nation. I will not try to revive the Committee of Union and Progress. I will not serve the interests of any existing political party. I swear in the name of Allah.⁴¹¹

It is seen that the Nationalists needed to repeat again that they were not the successors of the unionists and would not try to revive unionism. Also, they explicitly expressed that their ultimate aim was to assure the salvation of homeland and nation. This was an important and required attempt because the people wanted to be sure about their irrelation with the unionist. In fact, the Nationalists had to elucidate this debatable point because Damat Ferid and some journalists, such as Ali Kemal, Refi Cevat, and Said Molla asserted that the Nationalist were followers of unionists and they would destroy the country by deceiving the innocent Turkish-Muslim people. With this oath, the Nationalists refused any claim accusing them of being unionist.

⁴⁰⁹ İnan, *Ibid.*, p. 36; Jaeschke, *Ibid.*, p. 61.

⁴¹⁰ İnan, *Ibid.*, pp. 36-37; Kili, *Ibid.*, pp. 44-45; Eroğlu, *Ibid.*, p. 191; Aydemir, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 120.

⁴¹¹ "Saadet ve selamet-i vatan ve milletten başka kongrede hiçbir maksad-ı şahsi takip etmeyeceğime, İttihat Terakki Cemiyeti'nin ihyasına çalışmayacağıma, mevcut fırka-yı siyasiyeden hiçbirisinin amal-i siyasiyesine hadim olmayacağıma Vallahi Billahi." *Açıksöz*, No.17, 19 Teşrin-i Evvel 1335 [19.10.1919], p. 4.

After the oath, as the chief organizer of the meeting, Mustafa Kemal opened the congress by delivering a speech and he was also elected the Chairman of the Congress. Some of the Anatolian press could follow the developments about the Sivas Congress. *Albayrak* published the speech of Mustafa Kemal Pasha in its issue dated as September 11, 1919. In addition, *İrade-i Milliye*, which was started to be printed after the Congress, gave coverage to the speech of Mustafa Kemal in its columns on September 14, 1919. The newspaper announced the news under the title: *The opening speech delivered by the Chairman of the Congress Mustafa Kemal Pasha, in the convention of the Congress*. Mustafa Kemal addressed the delegates as follows:

... In the East, the Armenians began their preparations for expanding to the Kızılırmak, and already began to massacre at our borders. It was tried to actualize the dream of Pontus Kingdom in our Black Sea coasts. Adana, Antep, Maraş, Konya, Antalya and Thrace were occupied. The center of the state was restricted and came under foreign domination with the occupation of the capital of the Sultanate and the center of the Caliphate.⁴¹²

Following of the speech, Mustafa Kemal pointed out in general manner that “the purpose of the Congress was to complete the national unity and to save the country from the invasion of the enemies, and to establish a modern administration that the Turkish nation deserved and lived independently for years after.” Later on, he explained the evil situation of the country and suggested what possible measures should be taken for liberation. Mustafa Kemal also expressed his hope that the İstanbul Government, which ignored the Constitution and failed to convene the Parliament, would be able to see the right way by means of decisions, which would be taken in the Congress.⁴¹³ *İrade-i Milliye* also published a telegraph sent by Mustafa Kemal to İstanbul in the name of the Sivas Congress. Mustafa Kemal, in his telegraph, displayed his respect and loyalty to the Sultan-Caliph.⁴¹⁴ Meanwhile, he

⁴¹² “Şarkta, Ermeniler Kızılırmak'a kadar tevessü' hazırlıklarına ve şimdiden hudutlarımıza kadar dayanan katliam siyasetine başladı. Karadeniz sahillerimizde Pontus Krallığı hayalinin tahakkukuna bile çalışıldı. Adana, Ayıntab, Maraş ve Konya havalisine kadar Antalya işgal ve Trakya da işgal mıntıkasına idhal edildi. Payitaht-ı Saltanat ve Makarr-ı Hilâfetin ise hükümdar saraylarına kadar boğucu bir tarzda işgali suretiyle kalbgah-ı devlette ecnebi inhisar ve tahakkümü teessüs etti.” *İrade-i Milliye*, No.1, 14 Eylül 1335 [14.09.1919], pp. 2-3.

⁴¹³ *İrade-i Milliye*, No.1, 14 Eylül 1335 [14.09.1919], pp. 2-3. Also See, *Albayrak*, No.26, 11 Eylül 1335 [11.09.1919], p. 1.

⁴¹⁴ ...Kongre Hey'et-i umumiyesi tevfi-kât-ı ilâhiyeye müsteniden makam-ı muallâ-yı hilâfet-i celileleriyle saltanat-ı seniyelerinin ve milletle memleketin hukuk-ı meşrûasını ve gerek şimdiye kadar

had never sided against the Sultan until the end of the National Struggle. He always reacted to the attitude and activities of the governments in İstanbul.

When the delegates set to work in the Congress, they were confronted with an attempt of raid by Ali Galip, *the Governor of Elazığ*. The İstanbul Government sent a telegraph on September 3, 1919, instructing Ali Galip to dissolve the Sivas Congress and to arrest Mustafa Kemal and delegates. *İrade-i Milliye* later published this telegraph under the title of “Documents of Betrayal”: The content of the telegraph covered the following instructions:

As you know, a few people gathered in Erzurum under the name of the congress and took some decisions. Neither these persons nor their decisions are significant. But these situations caused to some rumors. They are reflected in Europe with a very bad exaggeration. For this reason, this leaves very bad impressions. ...It is understood from the correspondances that the known persons gathered in Erzurum will soon meet in Sivas and gather again a congress. It was known by the Government that gathering of five or ten such people in there produced nothing. But it is not possible to tell them to Europe. That is why it is necessary not to allow them to gather there. ...We send you to there for this purpose. ...You should go secretly to Sivas and arrest them immediately, and send to İstanbul.⁴¹⁵

It can be understood from the telegraph that the İstanbul Government ignored the decisions of the Erzurum Congress and it still underestimated the Nationalists and movement. The Government evaluated the congresses as small pockets of unrest.

As soon as Mustafa Kemal learnt the attempt and ordered the troops to capture Ali Galip and his partners in crime in Malatya. However, they could not be arrested and run away from the city. In that way, the attempt of the İstanbul Government to break up the Congress failed.⁴¹⁶

müdâfaa hususunda ittihaz edeceği tedâbiri tezekküre başlamıştır. Bu vesile-i müteyemmine ile sedde-i seniye-i hilâfetpenâhîlerine teyid-i sadakat ve ubudiyeti bir vazife-i diniye ve milliye addederler... 5 Eylül sene 335 Sivas'ta mün'akit Umumî Kongre Hey'eti. *İrade-i Milliye*, No.1, 14 Eylül 1335 [14.09.1919], p. 3.

⁴¹⁵ *İrade-i Milliye*, No. 2, 17 Eylül 1335 [17.09.1919], pp. 2-3.

⁴¹⁶ The telegraph coded 906, had to be passed through the center of Sivas in order to be reached Elazığ; thus, this telegraph was deciphered by the Nationalists; that's why the attempt of a raid was uncovered. While Ali Galip and Major C. Noel, a British officer, were gathering their gendarmerie force and Kurdish forces in Malatya, Mustafa Kemal moved quickly and ordered troops to arrest both of them. However, Ali Galip was able to escape from Malatya not to be captured by the Nationalists. Hence, this suppression attempt of the İstanbul Government resulted in failure. He left behind him several criminal pieces of evidence revealing that his main purpose was to suppress Mustafa Kemal Pasha and other Nationalists. For further information, See Kamil Erdeha, *Milli Mücadelede Vilayetler ve Valiler*, (İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1975), pp. 125-138.

The Sivas Congress lasted a week and the delegates concluded their meetings on September 11, 1919. Nationalist paper, *İrade-i Milliye* was able to publish the resolutions of the Sivas Congress in its issue dated as October 2, 1919. The newspaper expressed that the decisions of the Sivas Congress was similar with those decisions taken in Erzurum, and the paper did not make any comment on the resolutions. The newspaper announced the resolutions with this headline: *The main principles in the declaration of the Erzurum and later the Sivas General Congress of SDR of Anatolia and Rumelia on September 11, 1919*. That is, the paper published again the same principles of the Erzurum Congress as those of the Sivas Congress. The resolutions published in the newspaper covered the decisions:

The entire country in the national frontiers is an indivisible whole. The independence of the nation and the integrity of the country and the immunity of the center of Sultanate and Caliphate are accepted. The rights of non-Turkish minorities living in our country will be observed; however, no privileges, which could impair our political sovereignty or our social equilibrium, shall be granted to them. The main object is to consolidate the National Forces into a ruling factor and to establish the will of the nation as the sovereign power. We kindly accept the foreign aid from any state on condition that it must respect the integrity of our country and the independence of our nation. The principle of unified defense and united resistance shall be adopted for the purpose of resisting “any attempt at occupation or intervention or annexation.”⁴¹⁷

In addition to these resolutions, the following of the news, the paper wrote that the Congress decided to be held the elections and to convene the Ottoman Parliament. Also, the Congress wanted to be established a government rested on the national will.

Another important nationalist newspaper in Anatolia, *Albayrak*, which was media organ of SDR in Erzurum, printed the decisions of the Congress on September 11, 1919. *Açıksöz*, which was as the media organ of the national organization in Kastamonu, was able to publish to the principles of the Sivas Congress on October 26, 1919. Both of them published the resolutions of the Sivas Congress under title of

⁴¹⁷ *İrade-i Milliye*, No.5, 2 Teşrin-i Evvel 1335 [2.10.1919], pp. 2-3. For further information about resolutions, See Mahmut Goloğlu, *Sivas Kongresi*, (İstanbul: TİBKY, 2008), pp. 93-94; Uluğ İğdemir, *Sivas Kongresi Tutanakları*, (Ankara: TTK, 1969), pp. 113-115; Kemal Arıburnu, *Sivas Kongresi: Samsun’dan Ankara’ya Kadar Olaylar ve Anılarla*, (Ankara: AAMY, 1997), pp. 68-70.

“The main principles in the declaration of the Erzurum and later the Sivas General Congress of SDR of Anatolia and Rumelia on September 11, 1919.”⁴¹⁸

According to the resolutions published in *İrade-i Milliye*, it seems that the Sivas Congress agreed at once the decisions passed by the Erzurum Congress. As distinct from the resolutions approved by the Erzurum Congress, as it was also indicated in the news that the National cause was gathered under a single roof of “SDR of Anatolia and Rumelia”, which endeavoured to rescue of the whole country.⁴¹⁹ Moreover, the general result that can be inferred from the resolutions is that the Sivas Congress gained “a national dimension” to the National Struggle by suggesting measures for the salvation of the whole country, not only Eastern part.⁴²⁰ In other words, the Sivas Congress enabled the National cause to rise from local to the national plane. The Representative Committee formed in by the Erzurum Congress was assigned to enforce the decisions of the Sivas Congress and the number of members of it increased from nine to sixteen.⁴²¹

The newspapers in İstanbul were able to publish the resolutions of the Sivas Congress after the withdrawal of Damat Ferid cabinet October 3, 1919. As one of the most influential and nationalist newspapers, *Vakit* gave wide coverage to the decisions of the Sivas Congress on October 5, 1919. The newspaper published the news with the uniformed pictures of Mustafa Kemal Pasha and Rauf Bey. *Vakit* highlighted the decisions under the headline; *The reasons of the National movement in Anatolia – The decisions of the Sivas Congress*. The newspaper started to narrate the event with an introduction:

⁴¹⁸ *Albayrak*, No.26, 11 Eylül 1335 [11.09.1919], p. 1; *Açıksöz*, No.18, 26 Teşrin-i Evvel 1335 [26.10.1919], p. 2.

⁴¹⁹ According to Mazhar Müfit Kansu, “The only aim of the SDR of Anatolia and Rumelia was to save and to protect the Turkish homeland and to preserve the Turkish national unity, and to prevent the slavery and the threat of separation by depending on the national revolution.” Mazhar Müfit Kansu, *Erzurum’dan Ölümüne Kadar Atatürk’le Beraber*, Vol. I, (Ankara: TTK, 1966), p. 231.

⁴²⁰ Emine Kısıklı, “Sivas Kongresi’nin Milli Mücadele’de Kamuoyu Oluşturması Açısından Önemi”, *TİTE-AYD*, Vol. XVI, (1988), p. 35.

⁴²¹ The members of the Representative Committee after the Sivas Congress were as follows: Mustafa Kemal Paşa, Rauf Bey, Eyüpzade İzzet Bey, Hoca Raif Efendi, Hacısalihzade Servet Bey, Sadullah Efendi, Hacı Favzi Efendi, Hacı Musa Bey, Bekir Sami Bey, Refet Bey, Kara Vasıf Bey, Mazhar Müfit Bey, Ömer Mümtaz Bey, Hüsrev Sami Bey, Hakkı Behiç Bey, Ratıpzade Mustafa Bey. Kısıklı, *Ibid.*, p. 35; İnan, *Ibid.*, p. 38.

As it is known, the ‘Movement of Freedom’ (Harekat-ı Ahrarane) expressed as the Anatolian movement started with the resolutions of General Congress gathered in Sivas after the Erzurum Congress. This Congress consisted of representatives of the national unions formed throughout our country. According to *İrade-i Milliye* published in Sivas, all the delegates swore before the negotiations started.⁴²²

After this prologue, the newspaper gave the text of the oath sworn by the delegates in Sivas. Also, the paper shared the full text of opening speech of Mustafa Kemal Pasha. Then, *Vakit* published the whole of the proclamation of the Sivas Congress.

The newspaper summarized the proclamation as follows:

With a proclamation addressing to the nation, the Congress elucidates what the goal of the National movement is: to achieve the national independence, to prevent the intervention and occupation, to respect the rights of non-Muslim elements, and to make sovereign the national will; the Congress also takes kindly to technical, industrial, and financial foreign aid from any state, which does not pursue invasive policy.⁴²³

As it is seen from the tone of the newspaper, it welcomed warmly the achievements of the Nationalist. The paper also considered the Anatolian Resistance as a “the Movement of Liberation/Freedom”. Contrary to common belief, *Vakit* accepted the Sivas Congress as the starting date of the National movement rather than the Amasya Circular. Most probably, the newspaper assumed the Sivas Congress as the most effective attempt in the National Struggle. There were two important reasons for this assumption. One of them was that the Sivas Congress was a general/national congress and took resolutions concerned about the destiny of the whole country. Secondly, the resolutions and practices of the Sivas Congress caused to withdraw of Damat Ferid Pasha cabinet, which had posed the greatest obstacle to the National movement. This was a great success of the Nationalists; thus, they - for the first time - took a productive result in National Struggle.

Another newspaper that gave coverage to the news of the Sivas Congress in its columns was anti-nationalist journal, *Alemdar*. The paper announced with these headlines: “The conditions in Anatolia are progressively clarified-New Details-Congresses.” After the newspaper published the whole proclamation of the Sivas Congress, it made such an introduction; “The Anatolian newspapers that have been imprisoned in post offices for months came yesterday and have brought us

⁴²² *Vakit*, No.691, 5 Teşrin-i Evvel 1335 [5.10.1919], p. 1.

⁴²³ *Ibid.*, p. 1.

considerable amount of information about the conditions in Anatolia. Miserable Motherland is in need of calm and peace. The wishes of Anatolia: The remains of the CUP and the Ferid Pasha Cabinet.’’ After this prologue, *Alemdar* started to complain about hiding of the Anatolian movement by Damat Ferid Pasha and implementing censorship on the press. The paper showed the reaction to this situation as follows:

The capital has not become aware of what had been going on in Anatolia for months. The Ferid Pasha cabinet resorted to such violent measures to prevent being known of the events that took place in the Motherland, so there was no possibility that even the smallest news from Anatolia would be leaked. Even if sometimes real, sometimes overstated, or distorted news came, it was not possible to mention them in the newspapers or even by implication.⁴²⁴

As it is understood from news that Damat Ferid Pasha wanted to restrain spreading of information about Anatolian Resistance by preventing distribution of the Anatolian newspapers in İstanbul. He most probably tried to avoid the reactions of patriotic people and any confusion in İstanbul. All of these attempts proved that Damat Ferid had no longer ignored or underestimated the National movement since the movement had reached the level to threaten the power of Ferid Pasha. Even though Damat Ferid restrained the İstanbul and Anatolian press to provide information about the Anatolian movement, it is known that the underground resistance organizations and some of the intelligentsia in İstanbul were familiar with the national cause and they followed what was happening in Anatolia.

In addition to these comments, *Alemdar* also argued that the Nationalists were the follower of unionists and the Anatolian movement was managed by the unionist groups. The journal narrated this point with following expressions:

We have read the Anatolian newspapers that came yesterday and noticed that the whole Anatolia supported the efforts to preserve the integrity the Ottoman; already the opposite has not been expected. However, there is a possibility that it makes everyone anxious: This (the National movement) is also creation of the unionist bureau? It is not possible not to understand this truth while reading the newspapers. If the unionists and their assistants had not mixed up their ominous names in this movement, which had emerged as a sacred goal, in order not to drag this country to greater trouble and and the Government of Ferid Pasha had not kept secret the truth

⁴²⁴ *Alemdar*, No.294-1594, 5 Teşrin-i Evvel 1335 [5.10.1919], p. 1.

of the situation, we are sure that the slightest separation and misunderstanding are not seen in the country. We insist on our view.⁴²⁵

As the last news from the İstanbul newspapers, it is necessary to mention the quotation published in *Yeni Gün*. The paper shared the news by taking from the French press. The news is important in terms of evaluating both the Erzurum and Sivas Congresses. The news included the following thoughts as reaction to the decisions of the Congresses:

As it happens usually, those who mutinied in the name of right do not recognize the rights of the others. In this regard, the two Congresses organized by Nationalist had decided on principles which cannot be accepted. Therefore, even if the Allied powers, as a capitalist state, want to operate Turkey for their own account before all else, it is important to keep in mind that Arabs and Armenians are also rightful...⁴²⁶

As it is explicitly seen that the French newspaper claimed that the Nationalists did not take the rights of minorities into consideration and minorities had also rights in borders of Turkish. On the other hand, *Yeni Gün* criticized the news and put forward that the French newspaper did not know and grasp completely the the decisions of the Erzurum and Sivas Congresses. Accordingly, the journal asserted that the French newspaper made aforementioned judgements without comprehending the essence of the resolutions and these judgements were based on previous information. Lastly, *Yeni Gün* added that there was no indication that the decisions of the both Congresses envisaged negative thoughts towards non-Turkish elements.

In fact, the Sivas Congress had been a turning point of the National Struggle. The Congress became the mainstay of Turkish national unity and the unification of the national unions and the Representative Committee became the heralds of the new Turkish state. Additionally, it was indicated in foreign official documents that the National movement began to develop towards an “independent republic” in Anatolia after the Sivas Congress.⁴²⁷

⁴²⁵ *Alemdar*, No.294-594, 5 Teşrin-i Evvel 1335 [5.10.1919], p. 1. For the similar approaches, See *Peyam*, No.304-62, 5 Teşrin-i Evvel 1335 [5.10.1919], p. 2.

⁴²⁶ *Yeni Gün*, No.221, 28 Teşrin-i Evvel 1335 [28.10.1919], p. 3. From *L'Humanite*.

⁴²⁷ British Admiral De Robeck made this situation clear in the report dated on September 17, 1919, sent to Lord Curzon: “According to all reports, the National movement develops towards an independent republic in Anatolia. This movement is supported by İstanbul, especially by the Ministry of War. A treaty signed by the Government will not bring peace and tranquility. Because the Nationalists will not accept it. The force of arms is necessary to get their approval. The Government's

The attempt of raid and the pessimistic attitude of the İstanbul Government caused to increase tremendously the tensions between the Nationalists and the Government. Moreover, the Nationalists started to press the İstanbul Government to hold the parliamentary elections immediately and to convene again the Ottoman Parliament (Meclis-i Mebusan) dissolved by Sultan Vahdettin on December 21, 1918. Therefore, the Government blocked the contact between the Nationalists and the Sultan, and the cabinet misinformed the Sultan about the developments in Anatolia. In response to this offensive attitude, Mustafa Kemal Pasha issued a telegraph like an ultimatum in the name of the Sivas Congress and sent to the Sublime Port. *İrade-i Milliye* gave coverage to this telegraph in its issue of September 14, 1919:

The nation has no confidence in any of you other than the Sultan. Your Cabinet comes between the nation and the Sovereign. If you persist in this obstinacy for one hour longer, the nation will consider itself free to take necessary action, and will cut off all relations between your illegal Cabinet and the whole country. This is our last warning...⁴²⁸

Throughout the night Mustafa Kemal Pasha and his counsellors kept vigil in the telegraph office; however, the İstanbul Government resisted its refusal to open communication with the Palace. Then, on the morning of September 12, a circular was sent out from all districts, announcing to break off all official relations and all telegraphic and postal communication with the Government until a legitimate Cabinet took over the executive power.⁴²⁹ Both nationalist journals *İrade-i Milliye* and *Albayrak* also published remarkable news about the break off the communication with İstanbul. In that regard, *İrade-i Milliye* interpreted the news with following statements:

The nation has seen the last official documents concerning the betrayal of the Council of Ministers that had prompted the Kurdish tribes to attack on the Turks in

order is no longer fulfilled. This movement also resembles the movement of Young Turk in 1908." Erol Ulubelen, *İngiliz Gizli Belgelerinde Türkiye*, (İstanbul: Cumhuriyet Kitapları, 2006), pp. 190-191.

⁴²⁸ Vatan ve millet hukuk ve mukaddesatını pâymâl ve zât-ı hazreti padişahînin şeref ve haysiyet-i mülûkânelerini ihlal ile teşebbüsât ve harekât-ı gâfilâneniz tahakkuk eylemiştir. Milletın padişahımızdan başka hiçbirinize emniyeti kalmamıştır. Bu sepeple hal ve istirahatlarını zât-ı hümayuna arz etmek ıztırındadırlar. Hey'etiniz gayr-ı meşrû harekâtının netâyic-i vahîmesinden korkarak millet ile padişah arasında hâil oluyor. Bu bâbdaki temerrüdünüz daha bir saat devam ederse millet artık kendisine her türlü harekât ve icraatında serbest telâkkide mazur görecektir ve bütün vatanın hey'et-i gayr-ı meşrûanızla sureti katiyede alaka ve irtibatını katedecektir. Bu son ihtarımla, bundan sonra milletın alacağı vaziyet burada bulunan ecnebi zabitanı marifetiyle i'tilâf mümessillerine dahi mufassalan bildirilecektir. *İrade-i Milliye*, No.1, 14 Eylül 1335 [14.09.1919], p. 3.

⁴²⁹ Kinross, *Ibid.*, p. 194; Kili, *Ibid.*, p. 52.

Sivas under the command of Ali Galip, and made attempt to prevent the nation from sending telegrams to the Sultan. Then, the nation went to the telegraph offices and continuously sent several maledictory telegraphs from all the provinces, the sanjak, and the districts of Anatolia to the traitor Government in İstanbul. The nation, from that day on, cut off all kinds of official and private communication and correspondances with the Council of Ministers. ...With this combined action, the nation proved to the world that it such a government does not deserve of governing...⁴³⁰

It is clear that the Nationalists considered the Damat Ferid cabinet as illegitimate administration. They also explicitly urged the Damat Ferid Pasha to resign the power.

Albayrak, one of the other nationalist Anatolian newspapers, gave coverage to the news emphasizing the illegitimacy of the Government in İstanbul. The paper wrote: “The nation is opposed to the Government. The sovereignty belongs to the nation. It cannot be abandoned and cannot be renounced. The Government has determined to disintegrate the homeland and to enslave the nation.”⁴³¹ The following of the news, the newspaper asked the Sultan to change the Cabinet immediately so that the nation has no confidence in the Government –in fact- Damat Ferid Pasha.

Another nationalist newspaper, *Açıksöz* called Ferid Pasha for resigning his post. The paper wrote that:

Even though today all Anatolia and the whole Ottoman country are against the Ferid Pasha cabinet, he still stands in his place. Why is he waiting for? The nation wants a determined, strong government. Although even a child understands that it cannot stand against this movement, why is Ferid Pasha waiting for.⁴³²

It is stated clearly by the all these news that the Nationalists thought the İstanbul Government under the head of Damat Ferid Pasha as an illegitimate government in the eyes of the nation. In addition, they attributed the evil situation of the country and falling of the national independence into danger to the wrong policies of Damat Ferid

⁴³⁰ *İrade-i Milliye*, No.2, 17 Eylül 1335 [17.09.1919], p. 1. For the similar content, See *Albayrak*, No.28, 18 Eylül 1335 [17.09.1919], p. 1. The cutting off all communication with İstanbul was “a show of force and a resistance by the Nationalists.” However, this was not enough for them. The next step was to force the resignation of the Cabinet. For this purpose, the Sivas Congress had declared that the Representative Committee would serve as a provisional Government, conducted the affairs of the nation according to the laws and in the name of the Sultan until a national Government, possessing the confidence of the people, should be formed. See Erdeha, *Ibid.*, pp. 103-106; Kinross, *Ibid.*, pp. 194-195; Kansu, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 275-276.

⁴³¹ *Albayrak*, No.27, 14 Eylül 1335 [14.09.1919], p.1.

⁴³² *Açıksöz*, No.14, 28 Eylül 1335 [28.09.1919], p. 1.

Pasha. Therefore, the Nationalists declared war against Ferid Pasha in order to have him withdrawn from the power.

According to one of the remarkable news published in the first issue of *İrade-i Milliye*, the wrong political actions and decisions resulted in emergence of the National Struggle. On this point, the newspaper showed the occupation of İzmir as the first reason of the National Resistance. Then, paper underlined that “Ferid Pasha cabinet was primarily responsible for the occupation of İzmir because the Government dismissed Nurettin Pasha, who had taken measures against possible Greek occupation, and assigned (Kambur) Ahmet İzzet, who removed the national organization by claiming an unionist formation.” Also, the news claimed that Damat Ferid could not fully defend the rights of the Turkish people in Paris Peace Conference and Grand Vizier stated that “the Government is in favor of forming an Armenia in the Eastern Provinces.” According to the paper, allowing Armenians to establish an independent Armenian state in the Eastern region also constituted another cause of the National Struggle. Lastly, the newspaper strongly criticized the statements of Damat Ferid, who described the National Forces and unions for the defense of rights as *brigand* and *gangs*, and undermined the actions of the Nationalists and their organizations. The paper finished the news by saying that National movement emerged from these reasons.⁴³³

The news confessed that Damad Ferid prepared the ground for disintegration of the country because of his wrong policy. He also jeopardized the future of the country and nation. Accordingly, the nation and the Nationalists did not want to see him in power and pressed him to withdraw from his post.

The İstanbul newspapers did not dwell on the issues of the National movement or and break off communication between İstanbul and Anatolia. However, *Yeni Gün* was able to publish long news about the Anatolian movement in its issue of October 13, 1919. It is worthy to handle the comments of the newspaper. The paper, which published the photographs of Mustafa Kemal Pasha and Rauf Bey, emphasized that “the main purpose of the National movement was to make the National Forces

⁴³³ *İrade-i Milliye*, No.1, 14 Eylül 1335 [14.09.1919], pp. 1-2.

effective and to make the national will dominant in order to achieve the integrity of all the Ottoman homeland, and to preserve the authorities of Caliphate and Sultanate.’’ In terms of break off relations between İstanbul Government and the Nationalists, the newspaper made following comments:

The delegates of the Sivas Congress completely cut off communication with the center after the revelation of the center's betrayal. There was no post or telegram anymore. The government has no longer remained reliance. It was a good experience showing that it did not depend on the nation. But the Cabinet did not want to leave his position. ...Of course this movement affected the government's relations with the outside, and the Allied powers also concluded that the Ferid Pasha cabinet did not represent the nation. As a result of this, they attempted to get in contact with the National Forces and ignored the Government. Thus, the outside connections of the Government were gradually interrupted. It was no longer possible to rule the government and Ferid Pasha was forced to withdraw from his beloved position. While the National movement worked for the country and the independence, those who wanted to rule the fate of the country acted like this.⁴³⁴

Unlike the Anotlian newspapers, *Yeni Gün* expressed that even the Allies thought that Damat Ferid cabinet did not represent the nation. The news also confessed that not only the resistance of the Nationalists, but the Allied powers also had influence on the fall of the Damat Ferid cabinet.

The following of the news, *Yeni Gün* also described the National movement as a movement that emerges from the heart of the nation. According to the paper, the fact that the accusation the Nationalists being unionist was a trick of the Government and it continued this trick until the withdrawal from the power.

3.1.5. Need of İstanbul Getting in Contact with Anatolia

3.1.5.1. Amasya Protocol and the Official Recognition

After the fall of Damat Ferid Pasha cabinet, the new Cabinet, which was more moderate and reconciliatory with the Nationalists was formed under Grand Vizier Ali Rıza Pasha on October 2, 1919. *İrade-i Milliye* thanked to the Sultan due to forming

⁴³⁴ *Yeni Gün*, No.206, 13 Teşrin-i Evvel [13.10.1919], p. 1.

of a Cabinet appropriate for the national goals.⁴³⁵ Moreover, *İkdam* shared interesting news of the French press about the new Government. The newspaper made comments on the Ali Rıza Pasha cabinet and its possible policy:

The policy of Ali Rıza Pasha, which is more a soldier than a politician, would be the same as the politics of Mustafa Reşit Pasha, *Minister of Foreign Affairs*, who is one of the most prominent proponents of French in the Ottoman Empire. Among the members of the cabinet, Cemal Pasha, *Minister of War*, is against the CUP and he is pro-French. Haydarizade İbrahim Efendi, *Shayk al -İslam*, is a well-known friend of Britain and with the assigning of him in the cabinet, it is desired to indicate that the Sultan does not want to separate Britain and France from each other, but wants to unite them especially to solve the Eastern problems.⁴³⁶

The evaluations of the French newspaper implied that Ali Rıza Pasha cabinet was considered reconciliatory in terms of foreign policy. On the other hand, the British press did not interpret positively the Ali Rıza Pasha cabinet. For example, an article published in *Yeni Gün*, desired that “it is certain that the newly established Government cannot show favour to the CUP and its Program.” This sentence proved that English also considered the Nationalists as the followers of unionists. According to the newspaper, “Ali Rıza Pasha would face many obstacles and the real problem whether he could overcome these difficulties, or not.”⁴³⁷ Apart from this, *İleri* published significant news of another British newspaper, *The Times*. It confessed that English was not pleased with the new Government. İstanbul correspondence of *The Times* quoted that “when looked the members of the newly established Government, the CUP was once again in power.” However, *İleri* criticized this news harshly and argued that the news of the British correspondent did not reflect the truth.⁴³⁸

During that time, the Nationalists were sufficiently active in Anatolia. This situation would have prompted the İstanbul Government to get in touch with the Anatolia. Therefore, the correspondances for negotiations started between Mustafa Kemal and Ali Rıza Pasha. Mustafa Kemal Pasha, who had attempted to negotiate with the Ali Rıza Pasha cabinet for reconciliation on October 2, 1919, stated that “the National Forces would support the Ali Rıza Pasha cabinet on condition that it recognized the

⁴³⁵ *İrade-i Milliye*, No.6, 7 Teşrin-i Evvel 1335 [7.10.1919], p. 1.

⁴³⁶ *İkdam*, No.8149, 17 Teşrin-i Evvel 1335 [17.10.1919], p. 3. From *Le Temps*.

⁴³⁷ *Yeni Gün*, No.224, 31 Teşrin-i Evvel 1335 [31.10.1919], p. 3. From *Near East*.

⁴³⁸ *İleri*, No.642, 23 Teşrin-i Evvel [23.10.1919], p. 2. From *The Times*.

national purpose determined in the Erzurum and Sivas Congresses.’’⁴³⁹ Around these days, *İkdam* made important comments about the internal policy of the new Government. The newspaper asked Ali Rıza Pasha to follow a unifying policy. Also, the paper made following comments on the policy of Ali Rıza Pasha: ‘‘Ferid Pasha described the Anatolian Resistance as a treacherous movement. The policy of Ali Rıza Pasha cabinet is to make an effort not to let any separation in internal politics.’’ In addition, *İkdam* claimed that ‘‘Ali Rıza Pasha saw the National movement as legitimate and reasonable.’’⁴⁴⁰

After the correspondances, Ali Rıza Pasha and Mustafa Kemal decided to talk about the demands of both sides in Amasya. Ali Rıza Pasha assigned Saih Pasha, *Minister of Navy*, to negotiate with the Representative Committee. The newspapers in İstanbul gave coverage to the news about the journey of Salih Pasha. For instance, A news in *Yeni Gün* reported that after Salih Pasha visited and said goodbye to the Sultan, he left for Samsun on October 15, 1919 afternoon, by Altay Steamer. The newspaper shared the knowledge that Salih Pasha would continue with the car ahead of Samsun.⁴⁴¹ *Tasvir-i Efkâr* shared a short interview of its reporter with Salih Pasha in Altay Steamer. Salih Pasha made the following statements without being mentioned the questions of the reporter: ‘‘I will first go to Samsun by the Steamer. From there, I will go to Amasya, then to Sivas. After staying in Sivas for a while, I will travel the whole Anatolia.’’ To the newspaper, Salih Pasha said his travel would last twenty days. In addition, Major Salih Bey, who was the First Adjutant of the Minister of War, and the Captain Sami Bey, who was one of the adjutants in the Ministry of Navy, accompanied Salih Pasha.⁴⁴² *Vakit* wrote about the journey of Salih Pasha:

The news was received that Minister of Navy, Salih Pasha moved to Samsun in order to arrive Amasya. after arriving in Samsun. On the other hand, according to a telegram of our private correspondent in Sivas, Mustafa Kemal Pasha, Rauf Bey,

⁴³⁹ 1) If the new Cabinet would recognize the organization formed in the Erzurum and Sivas Congresses and the the aims decided upon by them, the National Forces will support it. 2) The new Cabinet will not undertake anything of a binding character regarding the fate of the nation until the National Assembly has convened and actual control has been permanently established. 3) The delegates who will be sent the Peace Conference must be selected from among those who are cognisant of the aims of the nation and who enjoy its confidence. Atatürk, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 134; Aydemir, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 125-126.

⁴⁴⁰ *İkdam*, No.8135, 3 Teşrin-i Evvel 1335 [03.10.1919], p. 1.

⁴⁴¹ *Yeni Gün*, No.209, 16 Teşrin-i Evvel 1335 [16.10.1919], p. 1.

⁴⁴² *Tasvir-i Efkâr*, No.2872, 16 Teşrin-in Evvel 1335 [16.10.1919], p. 1.

Bekir Sami Bey and Vasıf Bey moved towards Amasya. They will negotiate with Salih Pasha in Amasya.⁴⁴³

The last news was from the Anatolian press. The following news about the journey of Salih Pasha was shared by *Açıksöz*. The newspaper reports of October 17, 1919, stated that “Minister of Navy, Salih Pasha was on his way to Samsun in order to reach Sivas together with adjutants of Minister of War and Navy. Since it is declared that there is a consensus between the National Forces and the Government, it can be estimated that this trip was made to discuss and negotiate better.”⁴⁴⁴

Unlike the İstanbul newspapers, *Açıksöz* accepted that the Nationalists and the Government had already reached an agreement. The newspaper evaluated that both sides would negotiate their terms in detail.

The negotiations were held between the dates of October 20-22, 1919, with participating of some members of Representative Committee, such as Mustafa Kemal Pasha, Rauf Bey, and Bekir Sami Bey, and Salih Pasha, the representative of the İstanbul Government. End of the negotiations lasting three days, five protocols were signed, two of them secret.⁴⁴⁵

The 1st protocol, signed on October 21, covered the articles: The military should not engage in politics, the unionism should not resurrected, prisoners, who were responsible for Armenia relocation (1915 Tehcir) should be punished.⁴⁴⁶ In the 2nd protocol included that Cilicia and its environment, İzmir, the Province of Aydın, Thrace and Edirne could not be separated from Turkish homeland and that privileges, which undermine and damage our political sovereignty and our social stability, could not be granted to the Christian elements. Moreover, representative of İstanbul should ensure that the Chamber of Deputies gave their consent to the decisions of Sivas Congress. Apart from this, the most important part of these negotiations in this section was where the Assembly would convene. The Nationalists thought that the gathering of the Ottoman Parliament in İstanbul was not suitable because of security

⁴⁴³ *Vakit*, No.706, 20 Teşrin-i Evvel 1335 [20.10.1919], p. 1.

⁴⁴⁴ *Açıksöz*, No.17, 19 Teşrin-i Evvel 1335 [19.10.1919], p. 3.

⁴⁴⁵ Şerafettin Zeyrek, “Amasya Mülakatı”, *AAMD*, Vol. V, No. 14 (1989), p. 470. For further information, See *Atatürk İle İlgili Arşiv Belgeleri*, pp. 67-69.

⁴⁴⁶ Zeyrek, *Ibid.*, p. 470; Atatürk, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 167-168.

problems. Therefore, it was decided that the Assembly would be convened in secure region in Anatolia until a peace treaty was signed with the Allies.⁴⁴⁷ The 3rd protocol was about making the elections in a free environment, and the Representative Committee should have not interfered with parliamentary elections. In addition, the committee would help the pro-unionists not be elected as deputies.⁴⁴⁸ The 4th and the 5th protocols were made secret. In secret sessions, it was decided that some commanders would be removed from the army and a number of military officers would be given to the Court Martial. Also, it was asked from the Government to bring those exiled Malta, to İstanbul. Finally, the list of a committee, which would be sent to the Peace Conference, was determined.⁴⁴⁹

When examined the articles in detail, it can be seen that the Representative Committee was not ordinary formation, but it was an authoritative “government”, which was able to bargain with the İstanbul Government. In addition, it is clearly seen that the Nationalists began to suppress the İstanbul Government with these conditions. In other word, the Nationalists tried to have influence on the Government and its activities.

These protocols were not published in the press, *Yeni Gün* sahred a news about the interviews based on the information given by its special correspondent. While Salih Pasha had not yet arrived İstanbul, the newspaper wrote that “a complete consensus was achieved between the Government and the Nationalists.” According to the newspaper, both sides had no controversy and “this travel is a measure taken with the purpose of confirming all the details of the agreement, whose principles had already been settled.” Also, the elections would be held in full freedom as the national organization wanted as well and the results of the elections would also be announced soon.⁴⁵⁰

⁴⁴⁷ Zeyrek, *Ibid.*, p. 471. During the negotiations, Salih Pasha stated that he could promise on his behalf for this article. Already, this article was rejected by the İstanbul Government on the grounds that it was contrary to the Constitution. İnan, *Ibid.*, p. 42.

⁴⁴⁸ Zeyrek, *Ibid.*, pp. 471-473.

⁴⁴⁹ Atatürk, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 170-171; Zeyrek, *Ibid.*, pp. 471-473.

⁴⁵⁰ *Yeni Gün*, No.218, 25 Teşrin-i Evvel 1335 [25.10.1919], p. 1.

İleri informed its readers that Salih Pasha, who had gone to Amasya to exchange ideas about some details of consensus with the representatives of the National Forces, returned by Altay Steamer to İstanbul with Vasıf Bey, who was the representative of the National Forces in İstanbul. According to the paper, Salih Pasha directly visited the Grand Vizier and explained about the situation. Later, Ali Rıza Pasha gathered in the cabinet and Salih Pasha made the necessary explanations and the negotiations continued.⁴⁵¹

Tasvir-i Efkâr also published news about the return of Salih Pasha with Kara Vasıf Bey, who had been assigned by the Representative Committee as representative of the national organization in İstanbul. Also, the paper stated that Salih Pasha negotiated with Mustafa Kemal Pasha, Rauf Bey, Bekir Sami Bey, and Kara Vasıf Bey in Amasya. The newspaper claimed that the İstanbul Government and the National Forces reached a complete agreement and there was no contradiction between two sides.⁴⁵²

Yeni Gün had an interview with Kara Vasıf Bey, who came to İstanbul with Salih Pasha. Vasıf Bey replied the questions of the reporter as follows.

What is the status of the national organization?

It is an official society that has fully agreed with the Government and that is a assistant and deferential to all kinds of internal and foreign activities of the Government.

Who were the members of the Representative Committee who join in the negotiations with Salih Pasha?

Mustafa Kemal Pasha, Rauf Bey, Bekir Sami Bey and me.

What was the purpose of the trip of Salih Pasha?

To clarify the details of the national demands that could not be solved by the Government with telegraph, in face to face meeting. For example, there were many rumors in the newspapers. He came to see whether they were true, or not.

What kind of sentiment did Salih Pasha return with?

⁴⁵¹ *İleri*, No.645, 26 Teşrin-i Evvel 1335 [26.10.1919], p. 1.

⁴⁵² *Tasvir-i Efkâr*, No.2878, 22 Teşrin-i Evvel 1335 [22.10.1919], p. 1.

*I saw he returned with a complete sense of credence.*⁴⁵³

It can be understood from the explanations of Vasif Bey that the representatives of the Central Government and the Nationalists worked with mutual trust and cooperation. Additionally, it is essential to emphasize that the first statement of Vasif Bey explicitly showed that the Government recognized the Representative Committee as an official formation.

Amasya talks helped create a conciliatory atmosphere between Anatolia and İstanbul. When Salih Pasha returned to İstanbul, he began to work within the framework of the principles decided in Amasya, but most of the decisions could not be accepted by İstanbul Government. On the other hand, the Anatolian movement was officially recognized by the İstanbul Government with the help of the Amasya negotiations.⁴⁵⁴ Now, the Representative Committee was an authority that could have influence not only on Anatolia, but also on the İstanbul Government.

Before and especially after the Amasya Protocol, there were more remarkable news about the National movement in the Turkish press, however, these news were quoted mostly from the foreign press. The foreign press acknowledged that the National movement began to take on the character of a “phenomenon”, which foreigners had to pay attention and be careful about. The Anatolian Resistance, which was called as ‘*Nationalists, Kemaliler, and National movement*’ etc in the press, was transformed into a mass movement than expected.

In this regard, an anti-nationalist newspaper, *Peyam* published news quoted from the French newspaper *Le Temps*. It was important news that was far from the subjectivity and it took realistic approach towards the national developments in Anatolia. The paper attributed the reason for emerging of the Anatolian movement to “failure of Grand Vizier Ferid Pasha to enter into an honorable peace negotiation.” Also newspaper explicitly confessed that the Nationalists extended the field of activity after the Congresses and Mustafa Kemal had no longer recognized the Damat Ferid Pasha cabinet. Later on, it was claimed that the Ali Rıza Pasha cabinet

⁴⁵³ *Yeni Gün*, No.219, 26 Teşrin-i Evvel 1335 [26.10.1919], p. 1.

⁴⁵⁴ Ahmet Halaçoğlu, “Amasya Protokolü ve Osmanlı Hükümetleri”, *AAMD*, Vol. XV, No. 43 (1999), p. 231.

was generally welcomed in Anatolia, and İstanbul accepted the most of the demands desired by the Nationalists. As a result, the newspaper put a significant interpretation on the Anatolian Resistance:

...but it is time to be serious now. Too much blood was shed in the East as well. From İzmit to Van and from Mersin to Erzurum, a European crusade against the Turkish nationalism is not of concern, is it? ...The peace should conserve Turkey from Edirne to the Toros Mountains and border of Iran...⁴⁵⁵

As it is seen that the foreign press were aware that the National movement could not be ignored because it was not an “event”, but it became a “fact” in the course of time. It is also meaningful that an anti-nationalist newspaper shared this important news.

The other French news published in *İrade-i Milliye*, it was clearly asserted that “the Turkish forces, which were emerging in Anatolia, neither take the form of ordinary and plunderer gangs as it is supposed to be, nor turn into primitive subservients... They arise under the leadership of particularly talented presidents with a political and national program.” Also, the newspaper underlined that the awakening of the religious feelings of the Turks resulted from the Allied politics on Turkey; thus, a “strong military organization emerged around Erzurum and Sivas.” Finally, the newspaper came to the conclusion that if considered the national and religious unity in Anatolia, “there is no possibility to assume Turkey as decomposed inheritance to be shared.”⁴⁵⁶ It can be understood from the news that Western public opinion approved that the Anatolian resistance could not be underestimated and it became a political and military power. At least, the French press confirmed this allegation.

The effectiveness of the National Resistance was continuously emphasized by foreign press, infact the French press. *Vakit* published an article quoted from *L'Europe Nouvelle* on November 17, 1919. The paper argued that “the rapid spread of nationalism in Eastern Anatolia stemmed from the regular Armenian attacks. Also, it emphasized that the National movement actively spread from the Black Sea to the Toros Mountains.” According to statements of the newspaper, if a delegation was sent to Paris to represent the İstanbul Government, it would no longer be authorized

⁴⁵⁵ *Peyam*, No.314-72, 15 Teşrin-i Evvel 1335 [15.10.1919], p. 1. From *Le Temps*.

⁴⁵⁶ *İrade-i Milliye*, No. 8, 19 Teşrin-i Evvel 1335 [19.10.1919], p. 1. From *Le Temps*.

to act on behalf of its country. the paper said as concluding remarks: If it is wanted to stop the National campaign, this is very easy. For this, it is enough to conform to the decisions of the Erzurum and Sivas Congresses.⁴⁵⁷ The comments of the newspaper indicated that the İstanbul Government had no authority to represent the country and the Western public saw the Nationalists as the real representative of Turkey.

Yeni Gün gave coverage to significant news including important comments on the National movement and the future of Turkey. The title of article quoted from the French press was “A Voice of Right and Truth Rising from France.” The article expressed “that even the İstanbul Government, which was under the foreign pressure, was obliged to establish relations with the Nationalists (referring to the Amasya Protocol) at the end of the changes in domestic politics in Turkey.” In this regard, the newspaper recommended the Western states to get in touch directly with the “Anatolian Government”. Moreover, the paper reminded that the leaders of the Anatolian Resistance were considered as the prominent members of the CUP, despite the fact that leaders of the movement refused the any ties of unionist organization. The paper warned that it was necessary to understand whether they shared the same worldview with this committee, or not. Afterwards, the newspaper clearly said that “the interests of Europe and France were in need of peace and tranquility in the East; therefore, they should help to establish a strong government approved by the people in Turkey.” Additionally, the newspaper certainly suggested that: Turkey's own territorial integrity must be approved, and that's why, fair principles should be implemented, not imperialist ideas.⁴⁵⁸ Aforementioned news indicates that the western press, especially the French press grasped the graveness of the National movement. Furthermore, the western public opinion saw the national organization as the “Anatolian Government.” Further, the newspaper called the imperialists to treat fairly Turkish people and to approve the integrity of Turkish homeland. However, the West was still skeptical about whether the Nationalists were followers of unionists, or not.

⁴⁵⁷ *Vakit*, No.703, 17 Teşrin-i Sani 1335 [17.11.1919], p. 3. From *L'Europe Nouvelle*.

⁴⁵⁸ *Yeni Gün*, No.239, 15 Teşrin-i Sani [15.11.1919], p. 2. From *L'Information*.

3.2. The Relations of Ankara-İstanbul Until the Opening of Grand National Assembly

3.2.1. Opening of the Ottoman Parliament and the National Pact

The Representative Committee returned to Sivas after the Amasya Protocol and continued to work for a while to increase the influence of the National movement. Meanwhile, the Parliamentary elections had already started to be held all over the country. While the elections were continuing, the members of the Representative Committee, such as Mustafa Kemal Pasha, Rauf, Mazhar Müfit, and Hakkı Behiç Bey came to Ankara on December 27, 1919, with the aim of establishing more close contact with the parliamentarians.⁴⁵⁹ *İrade-i Milliye* informed its readers that the Representative Committee reached Ankara. The paper wrote that “the SDR of Anatolia and Rumelia that had moved from Sivas to Ankara was greeted warmly by some armed members of the National Forces and more than twenty thousand patriotic peasants in Ankara. Mustafa Kemal delivered a speech for the greeters.”⁴⁶⁰ On the other hand, the anti-nationalist journal in İstanbul, *Alemdar* criticized the Nationalists and it complained that “everyone in Ankara was forced to meet Mustafa Kemal. The public could not tell their complaints to him. The people who reacted to him were sending to Sarıkışla (a jail in Ankara)”⁴⁶¹

A nationalist newspaper published in İstanbul gave coverage a news expectating that Ali Rıza Pasha cabinet would return all military ranks to Mustafa Kemal Pasha. The content of the news as follows:

Mustafa Kemal Pasha preferred to stay in Anatolia as a loyal subject; hence, he chose to resign from his military service rather than going back to İstanbul and

⁴⁵⁹ The choosing Ankara as the center of Representative Committee was based on significant strategic reasons: According to the conditions of the year 1919, Ankara was considered as the ideal place to carry out a struggle to be started in Anatolia. Ankara was a more convenient center with its central location, the distance to the places occupied, the ease of communication and transportation. In addition, the Twentieth Army Corps under the command of Ali Fuat Pasha was in Ankara. Apart from these, the citizens of Ankara had been at the side of the National Struggle since the beginning and they had not obeyed the governor appointed by the İstanbul Government. Cemil Özgül, “Atatürk’ün Ankara’ya Gelişi” *AAMD*, Vol. X, No: 28, Ankara, 1994, pp. 138-139.

⁴⁶⁰ *İrade-i Milliye*, No. 18, 29 Kanun-i Evvel 1335 [29.12.1919], p. 2.

⁴⁶¹ *Alemdar*, No.391-2691, 11 Kanun-i Sani 1336 [11.01.1920], p. 2.

exposing known aftermath. In order to punish Kemal Pasha, the Ferid Pasha cabinet had decided to revoke his military rank and announced that he removed from his military service. According to the news received yesterday, the new cabinet will give the ranks back to Mustafa Kemal Pasha. Although the name of Rauf Bey is mentioned for the same issue, our investigation showed that there was no such a treatment in the Misnistry of Navy for Rauf Bey, who had resigned from military service.⁴⁶²

Thereupon, Cemal Pasha, *the Minister of War*, proposed the give military decorations and ranks back to Mustafa Kemal Pasha on December 28, 1919, and the Government accepted this proposal. The decision was approved by the Sultan on February 3, 1920. According to the decision, it was assumed that Mustafa Kemal had not been removed from the army, but he had resigned.⁴⁶³

Meanwhile, the Representative Committee allowed Rauf Bey, who would be elected the deputy from İstanbul, to go to İstanbul. The parliamentary elections of 1919 continued at full steam. In these days, both İstanbul and Anatolian press gave wide coverage to the news of the parliamentary elections. The anti-nationalists newspapers in İstanbul had various worries about the election process. For example, Ali Kemal, the editor-in-chief of *Peyam*, reacted to the decision of holding election. He said in one of his articles, “the God has inflicted calamity upon this country in the name of CUP. If you do not get rid of them, neither it becomes a legitimate constitutionalism, nor a fair election.”⁴⁶⁴ In this way, he claimed that the environment was not suitable yet for a new election because there was still danger of unionism. Ali Kemal asked the Government to eliminate the unionist and their influence in the country before holding elections.

The other important news was published in anti-nationalist newspaper, *Alemdar* on October 29, 1919. The paper complained about the interventions of the Nationalists in the elections. The newspaper argued:

...It is seen in the news sources that the unionist leaders, who took the name of the National Forces, interfere in the general elections in every corner of Anatolia and they encroach upon the rights of the nation, and even determine the candidates of constituents (second electors) in several election districts. Even in the center of the

⁴⁶² *Vakit*, No.690, 4 Teşrin-i Evvel 1335 [4.10.1919], p. 2. For the same news, See *İleri*, No.624, 5 Teşrin-i Evvel 1335 [5.10.1919], p. 2.

⁴⁶³ *Atatürk İle İlgili Arşiv Belgeleri*, p. 79. Sarıhan, *Kurtuluş Savaşı'nda İkili...*, p. 94.

⁴⁶⁴ *Peyam*, No.298-56, 29 Eylül 1335 [29.09.1919], p. 1.

capital, it appears that under the mask of National Congress, they influence people and election office by means of various means...⁴⁶⁵

As *Peyam* asserted, *Alemdar*, supporting the Freedom and Accord Party, also asserted that the elections were not held in secure environment and that unionists; or the Nationalists, intervened in the parliamentary elections by using “bargaining method.” The paper added this kind of election process would not be fair.

A nationalist newspaper, *İleri* gave coverage to an article concerning the parliamentary elections. The article put forward that the main duty of the National Forces was to fight against the enemy. In the article, Celal Nuri briefly wrote the following opinions:

...I am openly telling that if the National Forces intervene in the Government, look for the reason of this situation in the manner of the opposition party and its silence. Now, in the face of elections, important and kind duties fall to the National Forces and representatives of national organizations. This duty is to avoid any intervention, in the strict sense “vulgar politics”, and the Government...⁴⁶⁶

It is understood from the tone of the article that the newspaper was under the influence of rumors that the Nationalists had interfered the elections. Therefore, the author warned the Nationalists to abstain from influencing the elections.

Another nationalist newspaper, *Yeni Gün* also gave coverage to news about the elections in the issue dated as October 26, 1919. The newspaper shared an interview with Kara Vasıf Bey, who was representative of the Representative Committee in İstanbul. The questions of the reporter and the statements of Vasıf Bey were as follows:

How is the election process in Anatolia?

In many places, it has progressed considerably. Recently, even the second electors have been elected. It is actively continuing to be completed as soon as possible.

What is the attitude of the national organization towards elections?

⁴⁶⁵ *Alemdar*, No.318-1618, 29 Teşrin-i Evvel 1335 [29.10.1919], p. 1-2.

⁴⁶⁶ “...Açık söyleyeyim, eğer Kuvay-ı Milliye hükümete müdahale ediyorsa bunun sebebini muhalefetin hareket ve suskunluğunda arayınız. Şimdi seçim işleri karşısında Kuvay-ı Milliye'ye ve cemiyet temsilcilerine de mühim ve nazik bir vazife düşmektedir. Bu vazife, müdahaleden adi manasıyla politikacılıktan, hükümetten kaçınmaktır...” *İleri*, No.623, 4 Teşrin-i Sani 1335 [4.11.1919], p. 1.

*The national organization is acting in accordance with the declaration published on this issue. The national organization avoids interfering with the elections and even nominating someone.*⁴⁶⁷

Even though Vasıf Bey confessed that the Nationalists did not try to intervene the elections and did not have influence on the candidates, the Representative Committee made a great effort to be elected candidates who supported the National movement. Particularly, Mustafa Kemal Pasha encouraged nationalist people to run for elections and he talked face to face with the possible deputies in Ankara.⁴⁶⁸

In addition, *İleri* shared the statements of a citizen coming from Anatolia. The newspaper claimed that the Nationalist did not have influence on the elections and candidates based on the explanations of this person. According to the newspaper, the citizen described the situation in Anatolia as follows:

The elections are held in full freedom. Even in Kütahya, Afyon, Uşak and Bilecik, the Freedom and Accord Party participated in the elections and the constituents, second electors, were elected from non-Muslim elements. The public order is excellent in comparison with the past.... The Nationalist organization strongly prevents all kind attempt of brigandage and everyone is satisfied with the public order. Nobody is exposed to the pressure because of the elections. Rumors about enforcements in the elections are completely and certainly wrong.⁴⁶⁹

The Anatolian press also printed articles and news about the elections. For instance, *Albayrak*, a nationalist newspaper published in Erzurum, gave coverage to a report about importance of the elections. The title of the news was “which pupose should the Deputies of Eastern Anatolia have and What kinds of qualifications should they have?” According to the newspaper, the Assembly, which would convene, had great impotence since it would make decisions about the destiny of the country. Also, the duties of the parliamentarinas, which would be elected from Eastern Anatolia, were interested in the future of the country. As the newspaper described, the elected

⁴⁶⁷ *Yeni Gün*, No.219, 26 Teşrin-i Evvel 1335 [26.10.1919], p. 1.

⁴⁶⁸ In these days, Mustafa Kemal negotiated with the parliamentarians who came to Ankara in small groups and determined the main lines of politics that would be followed in the Ottoman Parliament. He asked deputies to elect himself as the Chairman of the Parliament and to form a Party for the Defence of the Rights (Müdafaa-i Hukuk Grubu) in the parliament. According to him, if the deputies were able to form a group in the Parliament in favor of the Anatolian Resistance, this parliament would become “the Anatolian Parliament of the National movement” rather than an Ottoman Parliament. Muzaffer Tayyip Gökbilgin, *Milli Mücadele Başlarken, (Mondros Mütarekesi’nden Büyük Millet Meclisi’nin Açılmasına)*, (Ankara: TİBKY, 2011), p. 553.

⁴⁶⁹ *İleri*, No.625, 6 Teşrin-i Sani 1335 [6.11.1919], p. 2.

deputies should have the following characteristics: “Parliamentarians must accept the principle that the Eastern provinces were as an integral part of the Ottoman territory and act jointly. In addition, they must have come to the sufficient level in terms of science.”⁴⁷⁰

In the issue dated as October 22, 1919, *Albayrak* published the telegraph of the İstanbul Government, saying that organizations and persons should not intervene the parliamentary elections.⁴⁷¹

Towards the mid of November in 1919, the parliamentary elections were almost completed in some regions of the country and the deputies had started to come to İstanbul for convening of the Parliament. *Tasvir-i Efkar* made explanations about the result of elections and the paper announced that “Cemi, Mehmet Ali, Lütü Fikri, Ferit Bey, who had been a pro-unionist, and independent candidate Mustafa Arif Bey had been elected as deputies of Kırkkilise. Mecdi Bey had been elected from Balıkesir.” Moreover, the newspaper wanted the Society of Trakya-Paşaeli to elect the deputies as soon as possible, and leave the future of the country to them.⁴⁷²

Albayrak informed the candidates of the deputies from Erzurum on October, 26, 1919: Mustafa Kemal Pasha, resigned from the Third Army Inspectorate, Celaledin Arif Bey, Süleyman Necati Bey, the Director and Editor of *Albayrak*, Major Zihni Bey from Erzurum, Gençgazade Hüseyin Avni Bey, Legal Advisor, and Nazım Bey from Erzurum, the Governor of Adana. The newspaper also gave personal backgrounds of candidates “so as to enlighten the people and not to fall into mistake.”⁴⁷³

Açıksöz reported a news on October 19, 1919, and warned that the parliamentarians should be heedful and they should deserve their positions in order not to repeat the mistakes made during the ten-year constitutional period. The newspaper, pleased that the Assembly would be reopened, emphasized that the nation could no longer be governed by autocracy (istibdat). The newspaper also shared the names of candidates

⁴⁷⁰ *Albayrak*, No.37, 19 Teşrin-i Evvel 1335 [19.10.1919], p. 1.

⁴⁷¹ *Albayrak*, No.38, 22 Teşrin-i Evvel 1335 [22.10.1919], p. 1.

⁴⁷² *Tasvir-i Efkar*, No.2927, 10 Kanun-ı Evvel 1335 [10.12.1919], p. 2.

⁴⁷³ *Albayrak*, No.39, 26 Teşrin-i Evvel 1335 [26.10.1919], p. 1.

for deputyship from Kastamonu. “The candidates from the center of Kastamonu, approved by the Representative Committee, are the following four members. Reşid Bey, Former Mutasarrıf of Malatya, Yusuf Kemal Bey (Tengirşenk), Former Judicial Advisor, Doctor Suad Bey, Former Hospitals Inspector, Fazlızade Besim Bey.”⁴⁷⁴

İrade-i Milliye announced the candidacy of Damat Alaeddin Paşazâde Samih Fethi from the center of Sivas. The paper wrote that Samih Fethi would work to preserve the integrity and independence of the country and he would obey the principles decided in the Sivas Congress.⁴⁷⁵

While the parliamentary elections of 1919 were continuing, anti-nationalist press tried to cast doubts on the legitimacy of the elections. The elections held in İstanbul were won mostly by those who believed the legitimacy of the Anatolian movement. As a reaction to this, *Alemdar* wrote that “we want national unity as well, but it must be free, and be cleared from the unionism.”⁴⁷⁶ *Alemdar* thought that the deputies, who supported the National movement, were follower of unionists and that the unionism had returned by elections. The similar news published in another anti-nationalist journal *Peyam*. Ali Kemal stated in his article that “the Union and progress had died, Live Long the Union and Progress.” With this expression, he implied that the nationalist deputies were proponent of unionist and that the unionism revived and gained strength again.⁴⁷⁷

Before the elections were completely concluded, some journals voiced their expectations from the new parliament. For example, an article published in *İfham*, said that “the services we expect from the parliament are not one, not five, even infinite. By confiscating the nation's destiny, achieving the salvation of the Turkish nation from the disaster will be the greatest blessing of the parliament.” According to the article, “it is expected as an ideal of service that the national rights and demands of Turk nation and Turkishness should be described and declared to

⁴⁷⁴ *Açıksöz*, No.17, 19 Teşrin-i Evvel 1335 [19.10.1919], p. 1.

⁴⁷⁵ *İrade-i Milliye*, No.8, 19 Teşrin-i Evvel 1335 [19.10.1919], p. 3.

⁴⁷⁶ *Alemdar*, No.350-2650, 1 Kanun-ı Evvel 1335 [1.12.1919], p. 1.

⁴⁷⁷ *Peyam*, No.378-136, 18 Kanun-ı Evvel 1335 [18.12.1919], p. 1.

Europe, to the Allied powers and to the Parliaments of Civilized world, and finally to the world public.”⁴⁷⁸

The foreign press was also interested in the Ottoman Parliamentary elections. In the course of the elections, the French newspaper, *Le Journal d'Orient* published a statement of Mustafa Kemal. The correspondent asked Mustafa Kemal: Whether the Representative Committee in Anatolia would be dissolved, or not, after the elections would complete and a parliament would be convened in İstanbul. Also, the reporter asked Mustafa Kemal whether he would avoid from representing the province of Erzurum, or not. Mustafa Kemal replied to the questions of the reporter as follows:

It is not necessary to mention my personal intentions on this subject. The wishes of the nation had been explained in the official proclamation of the Sivas Congress. The national organization will continue, and even will continue to expand, until the wishes of the nation are achieved. It is untrue and unfounded to avoid entering in the parliament.⁴⁷⁹

After the completion of the elections, the Ottoman Parliament, consisted of seventy-two deputies, convened in İstanbul on January 12, 1920, by reading the proclamation of Sultan Vahdettin. *Yeni Gün* announced the convention by saying that “the National Parliament will be opened at 1.30 pm.”⁴⁸⁰ *Vakit* informed that “today, the Chamber of Deputies is convening. The Sultan himself will go to the Parliament and he was present at there while the opening speech is delivered.”⁴⁸¹ Later, *İleri* expressed its pleasure due to the opening of the Assembly. The newspaper wanted Sultan Vahdettin to be seen as a ruler, who provides the freedom and independence of the people. The paper also asked that: “Is it possible to imagine the leader of Muslims without nation or a free and independent nation?” Additionally, *İleri* argued that the “caliphate and the sultanate are based on the nation and the ummah”, and that the “caliphate and the sultanate are the presidency of the nation.” In

⁴⁷⁸ “Meclis-i Mebusandan beklediğimiz hizmetler, bir değil, beş değil, birçok hatta na-mütenahi’dir.” Meclis-i Mebusan’ın “Mukadderat-ı Milliyeye el koyarak Türk milletini derbederlikten kurtarması nimetlerin en büyüğü olacaktır. “Bir hizmet mefkûresi olmak üzere, Avrupa’ya, Düvel-i İtilafiye konferansına, milel-i mütemeddine (Medeni Milletler) parlamentolarına ve nihayet Dünya kamuoyuna Türk’ün, Türklüğün hukuk ve metalebeti milliyesini ifham ve ilana muktedir bulunmasıdır.” *İfham*, No.156, 5 Kanun-ı Sani 1336 [05.01.1920], p. 1.

⁴⁷⁹ *İleri*, No.717, 6 Kanun-ı Sani 1336 [6.01.1920], p. 1.

⁴⁸⁰ *Yeni Gün*, No.297, 12 Kanun-ı Sani 1336 [12.01.1920], p. 1. Akşin, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 224-225.

⁴⁸¹ *Vakit*, No.785, 12 Kanun-ı Sani 1336 [12.01.1920], p. 1. Sultan Vahdettin could not attend the opening of the Assembly and his opening speech was delivered by Damat Şerif Pasha, Minister of Internal Affairs. See Akşin, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 225.

addition, the newspaper had an expectation that the Sultan punished those who had dragged the nation into the war. Also, the newspaper thought that it would be put into action by the Parliament.’’⁴⁸²

Hakimiyet-i Milliye shared the news of convention of the Parliament. The paper informed its readers as follows: ‘‘The Chamber of Deputies was opened by Grand Vizier on monday. The Sultan could not come because of being sick. ... Seventy-two deputies were present during the opening. This official opening seemed very sincere.’’⁴⁸³

İrade-i Milliye also gave coverage to the opening of the Ottoman Parliament and the paper announced the news following thoughts:

After a big break and hesitation, the Ottoman Parliament was convened. In spite of claims of the İstanbul press, the nation has elected the deputies within the free environment. We do not mean all the İstanbul press; unfortunately, some of the press in İstanbul told that the elections were held under the influence of some personal ambitions and secret propagandas. ...The nation itself has elected parliamentarians with the awareness. ...After a long and hesitant period, a bright and glorious sun rose today, and the nation was proud of seeing that the principles of nationality and national sovereignty are revived. ... While the representatives of the nation were their on way to İstanbul, we wish them to defend the right of devastated Anatolia and to protect the the right of the country with a very cautious national mind in the face of the situation of our foreign politics. ...Our deputies know and should know that the way of nation is the way of the God. Those who want to have their names written in history must make sacrifice themselves and all of their benefits to the nation.⁴⁸⁴

Yeni Gün also published the telegraph of the Representative Committee, presenting the respect and thank to the Sultan by virtue of convening the National Parliament.⁴⁸⁵

Mustafa Kemal Pasha, who had been elected as deputy of Erzurum, did not go to İstanbul and stayed in Ankara. Meanwhile, he could not become Chairman of the Parliament in spite of being decided previously. The Party for the Defence of the

⁴⁸² *İleri*, No.729, 18 Kanun-ı Sani 1336 [18.01.1920], p. 1.

⁴⁸³ *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, No.3, 20 Kanun-ı Sani 1336 [20.01.1920], p. 3.

⁴⁸⁴ *İrade-i Milliye*, No.21, 19 Kanun-ı Sani 1336 [19.01.1920], p. 1.

⁴⁸⁵ *Yeni Gün*, No.305, 20 Kanun-ı Sani 1336 [20.01.1920], p. 1.

Rights could not formed in Assembly. Instead, the Party for the Salvation of the Country (Felah-ı Vatan Grubu) was established under the presidency of Rauf Bey.⁴⁸⁶

The most significant act of the last Ottoman Parliament was to declaration of the decisions of the National Pact. After long discussions on the pact, the National Pact was adopted on January 28, 1920, with the sign of hundred twenty one deputies. However, the decisions were not published immediately. The National Pact was able to be announced to the parliamentaries of foreing states and the press on February 17, 1920.⁴⁸⁷

The İstanbul newspapers gave wide coverage to the National Pact in their columns. For example *Tasvir-i Efkar* published the decisions with title *the Program of the National Pact*. According to the newspaper, the National Pact covered the following decisions: “The places, which had been in the possession of the Ottman State during the signing of the Mondros Armistice (October 30, 1918), should remain within our national borders and The Ottoman-Islamic majority in the regions outside these places should determine its own destiny. Three Provinces (Kars, Ardahan and Batum), which had participated in homeland with their own will, can be held again a referandum on remain in the homeland. For the legal status of Western Thrace, which was under the occupation and the majority of the population was formed by Turks, can be applied plebiscite. The Turkish dominance over the city of İstanbul, the Sea of Marmara and the Straits should be ensured and the transits in the Bosphorus should be regulated in a way that the Turkish State could approve. Minority rights can be secured in proportion to the rights recognized in Muslim

⁴⁸⁶ Yücel Özkaya... [et al.]; *Milli Mücadele Tarihi: Makaleler*, Vol. I, (Ankara: AAMY, 2005), p. 246. The reason why Mustafa Kemal was not elected as the Chairman of the Parliament was attributed to the fact that he was absent from the meeting. Mustafa Kemal believed that the meeting of the Parliament in İstanbul, which was under enemy occupation, was likely to be disrupted. Its meeting elsewhere was possible either at the invitation of the Sultan or the Chairman or at the demand of a two-third majority of the members of the Parliament. See İnan, *Ibid.*, p. 64.

⁴⁸⁷ Özkaya... [et al.]; *Milli Mücadele Tarihi...*, Vol. I, p. 251; Gökbilgin, *Ibid.*, p. P. 528. The basic principals of the National Pact were prepared by Mustafa Kemal Pasha with deputies in Ankara. On this point, Mustafa Kemal Pasha said that “We also consulted the deputies as to the way in which the claims and aims of the nation should be expressed in short and wiewhty terms, so that these could form the basis of a concise programme. To gather some idea of it, preliminary drafts of such a programme were made, called the ‘National Pact’.” These basis were finally determined upon in the Chamber in İstanbul and were clearly defined.” See Atatürk, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 247; Eroğlu, *Ibid.*, p. 201.

communities in neighboring countries. The privileges which prevent our political, legal, economic development can not be granted to foreign states.’’⁴⁸⁸

It is seen that the program of the National Pact laid the foundation of national and indivisible borders of today’s Turkey, and the Turks demanded their minimum rights as a nation with this pact. In a sense, the National Pact can be considered as the mainstay of the National Struggle. Additionally, as it can be understood from the principles, the Pact included not only the minimum peace conditions of Turkey, but adopted also the ideology of national sovereignty and full independence. In this respect, the declaration of the National Pact was an important political history document that revealed the internal and external political goals of the National Struggle.⁴⁸⁹ Anti-nationalist newspaper published in İstanbul, *Alemdar* took sarcastic approach towards the National Pact. The paper made such comments on the issue: ‘‘May its fruitfulness abounds in, one more national thing emerged as well, nights gave birth one more national. Our nation mother has shown its presence again. It threw another national offspring. National Pact ... Oh my God, how hard to pronounce it, how ugly it is, how non-national words it is... What is the National Pact?’’⁴⁹⁰

As usual, the anti-nationalist newspapers could not adopt the National Pact and ridiculated the word ‘‘national’’. Additionally, they severely criticized the attempts of the Nationalists, tried to achieve the salvation of the country.

3.2.2. Official Occupation of İstanbul and its Effect on the National Struggle

The National Pact, accepted under extraordinary conditions, was considered as a declaration of freedom and independence. This daring action caused draw reaction of the Allied powers. In addition to this, according to the reports of John De Robeck,

⁴⁸⁸ *Tasvir-i Efkâr*, No.2989, 17 Şubat 1336 [16.02.1920], p. 1; *İleri*, No.756, 17 Şubat 1336 [17.02.1920], p. 4; *Yeni Gün*, No.333, 17 Şubat 1336 [17.02.1920], p. 2. For further information, See Özkaya... [et al.]; *Milli Mücadele Tarihi...*, Vol. I, p. 253.

⁴⁸⁹ Mustafa Budak, ‘‘Hangi Misak-ı Milli’’, *Yeni Türkiye Cumhuriyet Özel Sayısı*, Vol. I, No. 23-24 (1998), pp. 253, 256.

⁴⁹⁰ *Alemdar*, No.412-2712, 2 Şubat 1336 [02.02.1920], p. 1.

the British High Commissioner in İstanbul at that time, the National movement began to influence on the İstanbul Government so much that nationalists, fighting against the French forces in Maraş, could obtain weapons and bullets from the Ottoman Ministry of War and commanders of Army Corps. Therefore, they immediately intervened in the Government and wanted Cemal Pasha, *the War Minister*, and Cevat Pasha, *Chief of General Staff*, to offer resignations on January 20, 1920.⁴⁹¹ The Ali Rıza Pasha cabinet was really in in despair position and was unable to do anything because he was pressed not only by the Sultan and the Parliament, but by the attack of Greek and, also the National Forces. This pressure led to the resignation of Ali Rıza Pasha on March 3, 1920.⁴⁹² Three days later, the newspapers announced the establishment of the Salih Pasha cabinet on March 6, 1920.⁴⁹³ *Peyam-ı Sabah* did not welcome the new Government kindly. In the news, Ali Kemal accused Mustafa Kemal and the governments, which had ignored him, as the responsible of the desperate situation. He wrote that “Mustafa Kemal “an Officier of Order” abused his duty and acted against a “friendly” state (referred Britain) and he had to be punished.” Ali Kemal desired that “the newly formed government should be established by those who were against the Nationalists.”⁴⁹⁴

Salih Pasha came to power at a time when İstanbul was under intense pressure of the Allied powers. The political atmosphere was very fragile. Hence, a strong

⁴⁹¹ Sonyel, *İngiliz İstihbarat Servisi'nin Türkiye'deki Eylemleri*, p. 67; Gökbilgin, *Ibid.*, p. 537. Before the formal occupation of İstanbul, there had been the great struggle between the Nationalists and the Allies in order to bring the İstanbul Government under their influence and control. That is, both of them wanted to keep the Government under the control. The Nationalists tried to achieve this until the convening of the GNA on April 23, 1920 in Ankara. Fahir Armaoğlu, “İngiliz Belgelerinde İstanbul'un İşgali” *Bellekten*, Vol. LXII, No. 234 (1999), pp. pp. 470-471.

⁴⁹² Gökbilgin, *Ibid.*, p. 585; *Tasvir-i Efkar*, No.3004, 4 Mart 1336 [04.03.1920], p.1; *Yeni Gün*, No.349, 4 Mart 1336 [04.03.1920], p. 1; *İrade-i Milliye*, No.39, 8 Mart 1336 [08.03.1920], p. 1. The resignation of Ali Rıza Pasha was not met with a surprise, and Mustafa Kemal Pasha received it favorably. Because Ali Rıza Pasha, who had displayed the signs that he would act in harmony with the Nationalists since the beginning of his power, issued a circular dated as February 14, 1920, announcing that even though the National Assembly, which was the only place in which the national movement could find expression, had gathered and had begun its works, then the associations, which claimed to act in the name of the nation's will in any other place, were forbidden. Also, he emphasized that all machinations and actions tending to interfere with the affairs of the Government would be punished according to law. Gökbilgin, *Ibid.*, p. 585; Özkaya... [et al.]; *Milli Mücadele Tarihi...*, Vol. I, p. 293; Atatürk, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 259.

⁴⁹³ *İleri*, No.776, 9 Mart 1336 [09.03.1920], p. 1; *Tasvir-i Efkar*, No.3009, 9 Mart 1336 [09.03.1920], p. 1; Akşin, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 381.

⁴⁹⁴ *Peyam-ı Sabah*, March 6, 1920, p. 1.

performance could not be expected from new cabinet. Also, it seemed inevitable that the Government would encounter the fait accompli of Allies at any moment because they considered the decisions of the National Pact as dangerous to themselves and they violated the provisions of the Armistice. Hence, the Allies decided to intervene in İstanbul officially. One of the serious developments that led Allies to take radical measures, namely “official occupation” on İstanbul was the movement of instigation and mischief, which the Nationalists had started under the name of “National Organization.” Also, for justifying their occupation, the Allies put forward various pretexts, such as the defeat of the French in Maraş, and killing of Armenians in the city. In fact, the British found the way to punish the Turks by taking İstanbul hostage due to the Armenian deaths in Maraş.⁴⁹⁵ That is, the British authorities blamed the Nationalists for killing Armenians in Maraş and creating disorder in Anatolia. The British press even published news reflecting the claims of the British policy makers. *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* shared this news in the issue dated as April 23, 1920. In the news, the opposition group in England claimed that “although the Turkish army was demobilized after the Armistice, their weapons were not taken out of their hands. Thus, this prepared the ground for creating today’s mixed situation. In addition, the opposition put forward that Mustafa Kemal had a program aimed at killing all the Christians who reside in Cilicia. Lord Curzon replied to these criticisms of the opposition party on behalf of the government. Finally he said to agree with the allegations of the opposition party: “...The events of Cilicia started in

⁴⁹⁵ Armaoğlu, *Ibid.*, pp. 475, 479. As is known, at that time, there was a national struggle in Adana, Maraş, Urfa and Antep against the French occupation forces and their collaborator, Armenians. In particular, the Armenians provided all kinds of support to the French occupation forces and practiced implementations such as oppression, humiliation, extortion and killing against the Turkish people in these provinces. This situation increased the resistance ambition of the people living in this region against the occupations, especially the people in Maraş, and started a very violent and bloody struggle against France and Armenians. It was argued that, in the whole operation, approximately fifteen-twenty thousands Armenians lost their lives. In other words, Turks killed approximately twenty thousands Armenians(?) Finally, the French had to withdraw from Maraş on February 12, 1920. Therefore, Allies brought to account the İstanbul Government for the the Armenians. Armaoğlu, *Ibid.*, pp. 473-474. Özkaya... [et al.]; *Milli Mücadele Tarihi...*, Vol. I, p. 294; Kinross, *Ibid.*, 204. Actually, the representatives of the Allied powers at the First Conference of London were aware that the claim of killing twenty thousand Armenians was a lie and fiction. Ulubelen, *Ibid.*, p. 209; Tansel, *Ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 39.

January. These events resulted from the programs of the Young Turks (implied to Nationalists). This is doubtlessly clear thing.”⁴⁹⁶

Moreover, Refi Cevat published an article in *Alemdar* on February 25, 1920 and he mentioned the possible Allied occupation of İstanbul and exiles because of the actions of the Nationalists. It seemed that Refi Cevat almost announced the possible occupation as good news:

...The will of nation does not come true in vain. Everyone knows what the vast majority of deputies resemble. Tomorrow or on the other day, if the true will of nation requires the dissolution of this parliament, only a small minority can claim to have been elected by the nation. The end of this wildness never turns out to be blessing in disguise. We should concern about the country.⁴⁹⁷

With these expressions, Refi Cevat indeed wanted the Nationalists to give up their activities; otherwise, he asserted that these kinds of actions would result in disaster of the country. On the other hand, he implied that the possible Allied occupation was able to prevent the Nationalists to damage the country.

At the First Conference of London held between the dates February 12– April 10, 1920, the Allies made decision to reoccupy of İstanbul on March 10, 1920, on the grounds of the violation of the Mondros Armistice, the hostile attacks of Nationalists, the slaughter of Christians in Anatolia, disobedience to the instructions and weakness of the Government. In that way, the Allies intended to take the İstanbul Government under their control and also they wanted to suppress the National movement.⁴⁹⁸

On March 13, 1920, the British Government issued an order to the High Commissioner of İstanbul, de Robeck, to occupy İstanbul in harmony with French and Italian colleagues. According to the instructions, the Ministries of War and Navy would be occupied and the official offices such as police, gendarmerie, telegraph and post would be taken under control, the dangerous members of the CUP and leaders of the National movement would be arrested and the Parliament would be closed. Hence, on March 14, 1920, the British military authorities set to work by controlling

⁴⁹⁶ *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, No.24, 23 Nisan 1336 [23.04.1920], p. 3. From *Times*.

⁴⁹⁷ *Alemdar*, No.435-2735, 25 Şubat 1336 [25.02.1920], p. 1.

⁴⁹⁸ Abdurrahman Bozkurt, *İtilaf Devletleri'nin İstanbul'da İşgal Yönetimi*, (Ankara: AAMY, 2014), pp. 324-325; Ulubelen, *Ibid.*, p. 212.

the telegraph and declaring the martial rule, and also, they arrested hundred-fifty intellectuals in İstanbul on March 15, 1920.⁴⁹⁹

The Allied powers started to official occupation of İstanbul on Tuesday, March 16, 1920. In early morning of March 16, 1920, the British warships entered to the Galata Bridge and armoured cars rolled through the streets of İstanbul. British troops occupied police stations, military posts and the main public buildings as it had been decided.⁵⁰⁰ While the process of occupation was continuing, the Allied powers issued a proclamation about the occupation of İstanbul on March 16, 1920. The nationalist and anti-nationalist newspapers, such as *Alemdar* and *Vakit* shared the content of the proclamation on March 17, 1920. In the given proclamation, the Nationalists were considered equal with the unionists and it was said:

...While the Peace Conference was busy with this work, some persons, who embraced the ideas of the fugitive CUP, created a movement under the name of the national organization and did not take the orders of the Sultan and the central government into consideration. They summoned the exhausted people into the army and caused a fit among the various elements. They attempted to rob the people with the pretext of helping the National movement and started a new war. ...The reason for the occupation is to take necessary measures in order to ensure the implementation of the peace provisions that would be soon determined.⁵⁰¹

It was certain that the Allied powers described the Nationalists as unionists and they attributed the reason of the occupation of İstanbul to the unrest which the national organization prompted in Anatolia.

On the morning of the occupation, the occupying forces started to search the building of Ministry of War and the entire Turkish staff of the War Ministry was standing in the square outside. It was possible to witness some bloody actions. For instance, the household of Mersinli Cemal Pasha, *former Minister of War*, had offered resistance when British soldiers came to arrest him. In these events, two British and five Turkish soldiers were wounded.⁵⁰² Moreover, all over the city they searched houses

⁴⁹⁹ Bozkurt, *Ibid.*, pp. 325-327; Tansel, *Ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 41. Zeki Sarıhan, *Kurtuluş Savaşı Günlüğü, Mondros'tan Erzurum Kongresine*, Vol. I, (Ankara: Öğretmen Yayınları, 1986), pp. 374-375.

⁵⁰⁰ Bozkurt, *Ibid.*, p. 336; Sonyel, *İngiliz İstihbarat Servisi'nin Türkiye'deki Eylemleri*, p. 68; Kinross, *Ibid.*, p. 206; Tansel, *Ibid.*, Vol. III, pp. 41-42.

⁵⁰¹ *Alemdar*, No.455- 2755, 17 Mart 1336 [17.03.1920], p. 1; *Vakit*, No.848, 17 Mart 1336 [17.03.1920], p. 1.

⁵⁰² The United States High Commissioner, Admiral Bristol, commented on the severity of British actions: "The arrests made by British troops were carried out in rather an unusual way, though the

and entered the newspaper offices and they also implemented a strict censorship. For example, the offices of *Tasvir-i Efkar* and *Yeni Gün* were raided by the British troops and *Tasvir-i Efkar* closed until March 20, 1920.⁵⁰³ İstanbul's streets were full of Greeks and Armenians in British uniform. They were employed by the British Command as police in charge of public security and intelligence.⁵⁰⁴ In the meantime, the telegrapher Hamdi from Manastır informed Mustafa Kemal Pasha about the occupation while the process was continuing.

In the same day, British troops marched to the Parliament and demanded Parliamentary Guard to surrender Rauf Bey and Kara Vasıf Bey, waiting to be raided the Parliament. Rauf Bey thought that if the British troops did not raid and dissolve the Parliament, the GNA in Ankara would not be opened. In fact, he assumed the fact that dissolving of the Ottoman Parliament by English would pave the way of legitimization of the GNA in Ankara.⁵⁰⁵ After a short resistance, the Allies embarked them into British warship called *Benbow*, exiled in Malta with some nine others, including deputies, intellectuals and prisoners of various and dubious kind, on March 18, 1920.⁵⁰⁶ As reprisal for the deportations of the parliamentarians in İstanbul,

circumstances may have justified it. As an instance, in the case of the Turkish General, ex-Chief of General Staff, Cevat Pasha, he was taken in his night clothes and his hands were bound." Criss, *Ibid.*, p. 66.

⁵⁰³ Salih Tunç, "İşgal Döneminde İstanbul Basını (1918-1922)", (U.D.D.), (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi, 1999), p. 300; Kinross, *Ibid.*, p. 207. *Tasvir-i Efkar*, No.3017, 20 Mart 1336 [20.03.1920], p. 1. Although Salih Tunç claimed that *Tasvir-i Efkar* was closed until March 20, 1920, but I saw its publications between the dates of March 16-20, 1920. Actually, the Allied powers did not allow *Yeni Gün* to be published until March 20, 1920. However, *Yeni Gün* and *Tasvir-i Efkar* were not able to mention the occupation until March 20-21, 1920. See Tunç, *Ibid.*, p. 300; *Yeni Gün*, No. 361, 21 Mart 1336 [21.03.1920], p. 1.

⁵⁰⁴ Criss, *Ibid.*, p. 66.

⁵⁰⁵ Although Mustafa Kemal Pasha sent news to Rauf Bey to escape to Ankara, Rauf Bey had not escaped and waited for being raided the parliament by the British. He said in his memoirs that "... I have decided not to flee in order to put the British into a cruel and aggressive position in the eyes of the world and our nation. In the last telegraph, which I had written Mustafa Kemal Pasha, I informed him that 'we would stay and pay our debt of conscience' by reminding our last decision. Essentially, the Assembly had done the work that had to be done by working up to that day: The National Pact had to be got through, we got through it. Now, in order to reach our real goal, there was a job to be dispersed the Parliament. ... The friends there (in Ankara) could form new government and administrate by the Parliament that they would form. But the main thing is to provide the Parliament being raided by the British. Without this, neither the National Assembly nor the National Government could be established in Anatolia." See Orbay, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 29-30.

⁵⁰⁶ The delegation of eleven people, who were exiled to Malta in the first stage, consisted of Çürüksulu Mahmut Pasha, Mersinli Cemal Pasha, İsmail Cevat Pasha (Çobanlı), Hasan Tahsin Bey, Dr.

Mustafa Kemal Pasha immediately ordered to arrest of all British officers remained in Anatolia, including Colonel Rawlinson, who had arrived in Erzurum, on an official mission, to investigate the prospects of creating an independent Armenia, and to ensure the surrender of arms.⁵⁰⁷

In the occupation day, the İstanbul Government declared a short proclamation published in *Tasvir-i Efkar* on March 20, 1920. The Government invited the people to keep their calmness with the following statements:

After the memorandum given by the political representatives of the Allied powers this morning, İstanbul was brought temporarily under military occupation since the today (16 March). The Government will continue to exercise its duty. It is advised that everyone should be busy with their work and their strengths with full calmness.⁵⁰⁸

After Mustafa Kemal Pasha received news of the occupation from telegrapher Hamdi from Manastır, he enlightened all the governors, district governors, commanders of Army Corps and the national organizations about the Allied occupation of İstanbul. His circular letter was printed with the title “The Circular Forwarded to the General Governors and Commanderships” by *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* on March 18, 1920. Mustafa Kemal ordered that “everyone, regardless of who is an enemy or a friend, had to cut off all official contacts with the outside for a period of time. Moreover, he demanded that military or civilian authorities should continue to keep in touch with the Representative Committee.”⁵⁰⁹

Furthermore, Mustafa Kemal Pasha, in the same day, sent a protest telegram to the Diplomatic Representatives of United States, England, France and Italy; the Foreign Ministers in Neutral Countries; the Legislative Chambers in France, England and Italy. *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* gave coverage to the text of protest in its columns. In the protest letter, Mustafa Kemal stated that “the occupation of İstanbul, the raid of the Ottoman Parliament, representing our National Independence, and the arrest of some

Mehmet Esat Pasha (Işık), Hüseyin Rauf Bey (Orbay), Albay Ahmet Şevket Bey (Galatalı), Mustafa Vasıf Bey (Kara Vasıf), Mehmet Şeref Bey (Aykut), Ahmet Faik Bey (Kaltakkıran) and Numan Usta. For their duties and reasons for their arrestment, See N. Şimşir, *Malta Sürgünleri*, (İstanbul: Bilgi Yayınevi, 2009), p. 201-208; Orbay, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 37-38.

⁵⁰⁷ Şimşir, *Malta Sürgünleri*, p. 210; Selek, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 340.

⁵⁰⁸ *Tasvir-i Efkar*, No.3017, 20 Mart 1336 [20.03.1920], p. 1. Also See *Yeni Gün*, No.361, 21 Mart 1336 [21.03.1920], p. 1.

⁵⁰⁹ *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, No.16, 18 Mart 1336 [18.03.1920], p. 1.

individuals who acted in accordance with national goals, is to deal a blow to the principles which are fundamental to today's human society, such as liberty, nationality and homeland.’’⁵¹⁰

Apart from these attempts, Mustafa Kemal Pasha issued a proclamation on March 17, 1920 and sent it to all Governorships, Commanderships, and Society for Defense of Rights, Mayors, and the Society of the Press. *İrade-i Milliye* published this proclamation on March 18, 1920. The proclamation provided information about the attempts of the Allies to Turkish public opinion.

Perhaps the most important thing that drawn attention in four-article proclamation, was to accept that ‘‘700-year life and domination of the Ottoman Empire was terminated by the occupation of İstanbul. In addition, the proclamation emphasized the desire that the Turkish nation would win in the struggle for homeland and independence.’’⁵¹¹

It is seen that the last evaluation is very significant with respect to the legitimacy of the National movement. The Allied occupation of İstanbul was regarded as the official end of the Ottoman Empire as well as de fact to end of it. Now, the national organization was only authority to achieve the independence of the homeland.

As a matter of fact, the official Allied occupation of İstanbul can be interpreted that this event paved the way of justifying the National Struggle and the GNA, which would be convened in Ankara. As it is known that the Ottoman Empire was actually ended with the Mondros Armistice and now, the Allied occupation ended its presence officially. Moreover, the Parliament was annulled with the Imperial Decree dated April 11, 1920. All these developments provided the basis for gathering of the GNA and legitimizing its authority. In addition to these, the Representative Committee was the only body in Anatolia to have military and administrative

⁵¹⁰ Ibid., p. 1. For further information, See Atatürk, Ibid., Vol. I, pp. 284-285; Tansel, Ibid., Vol. III, pp. 50-51; Selek, Ibid., vol. I, p. 344.

⁵¹¹ *İrade-i Milliye*, No.31, 18 Mart 1336 [18.03.1920], p. 2. For further information, See Atatürk, Ibid., Vol. I, pp. 284-285.

authority.⁵¹² Additionally, although the opinion that “no danger of any serious rebellion in the capital” came true, coercive activities of Allies on March 16, played into the hands of Mustafa Kemal Pasha. Moreover, Halide Edib (Adivar), who thought that the occupation had a very positive effect on the Anatolian movement, interpreted the Allied occupation of İstanbul as follows: “We have all kinds of reasons to be thankful to (Milne) because he increased the prestige of the National movement to a great extent by resorting to the violence movement in İstanbul.”⁵¹³ In addition, to these comments, Kinross claimed that two events (the campaign of Greece in Anatolia and the occupation of İstanbul) put into action by the Allied powers made Mustafa Kemal's command become valid both in Anatolia and in İstanbul. He elaborated his ideas with the following statements:

The British had presented Kemal, for the second time, with a major political advantage. He lost no time in exploiting it. The occupation of İstanbul, as he saw it, and as he declared in an immediate proclamation, had destroyed the seven-centuries-old existence and sovereignty of the Ottoman Empire.⁵¹⁴

The Ottoman Parliament decided to suspend its activities because it was not able to precede its business comfortably under the oppression. Under these circumstances, some nationalist intellectuals, journalists and deputies immediately began to influx to the Anatolia in secret ways.⁵¹⁵

⁵¹² Ergün Aybars, *İstiklal Mahkemeleri*, Vol. I-II, (İzmir: Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1988), p. 10-11.

⁵¹³ Gotthard Jaeschke, *Kurtuluş Savaşı İle İlgili İngiliz Belgeleri*, trans. By Cemal Köprülü, (Ankara: TTK, 2011), p. 151.

⁵¹⁴ Kinross, *Ibid.*, p. 210.

⁵¹⁵ In terms of transition to Anatolia, the Lodge of Uzbeks (Özbekler Tekkesi) had an important place in the history of the National Struggle because the destination route started from the Lodge of Uzbeks in Üsküdar to Geyve. Those who wanted to go to Anatolia by means of Ata Efendi, the last Sheikh of the Lodge of Uzbeks, came to the Lodge, which was the first station and hidden shelter, and started their journey under the control of the Organization. - Sheikh Ata Efendi (1883-1936), a lawyer, was one of the founders of the Karakol Cemiyeti. He devoted the religious and spiritual values he believed to the liberation of the homeland. - Among the passers to Anatolia via the Lodge of Uzbeks, there were Fevzi (Çakmak) Pasha, İsmet (İnönü) Pasha, Celal (Bayar) Bey, Adnan and Halide Edip (Adivar), the father of Ali Fuat (Cebesoy) Pasha İsmail Fazıl Pasha, Mehmed Akif (Ersoy), Hamdullah Suphi (Tanrıöver), Celalettin Arif Bey, Yunus Nadi, Colonel Kazım(Orbay), Hüseyin Avni, Necati Bey, Zihni Bey, Necip Bey, İsmail Suphi(Soysallıoğlu), Sakallı Nureddin Pasha, District-Governor Seyfi, Major Saffet (Arıkan), Ahmet Ferit, İbrahim Süreyya, Nevres, Major Reşit, brother of Çerkez Ethem, Hüsrev (Gerede) Bey, Deputy of Keskin Rıza Bey, Deputy of İstanbul Ali Rıza Bey, Major Besalet Bey, Manastırlı Kolağası Nuri, Nuri (Conker) Bey, Captain İsmail Hakkı, Mehmet Ali and Mülazım-ı evvel Abdurrahman. Süleyman Beyoğlu, “*Milli Mücadele ve Özbekler Tekkesi*”, Üsküdar

As far as it is understood from the tone of the newspapers, the Allied occupation of İstanbul had not been a surprise for the press because İstanbul had already been under de facto occupation since November 13, 1918. Therefore, the press considered the occupation of İstanbul on March 16, 1920 as a formalization of the previous actual occupation. With the occupation, the Allied powers introduced strict censorship on the press; especially they tried to silence the nationalist newspapers. For this reason, the nationalist press in İstanbul was not be able to write too much in the beginning of the occupation. The general Anatolian press could lately receive the information about the event. However, they provided remarkable evaluations about the occupation in the later months.

Three days after the occupation of İstanbul, anti-nationalist journalist, Refi Cevad wrote an article in *Alemdar* and he accused the Nationalists of being responsible for this occupation. He made following comments:

...This was so up to three days. They applauded the cruelty; they praised brigands to the skies. Today, look the bigwigs now keep quiet; their finos (pet-dogs) started to mentor by forgetting big black marks on their foreheads. We never forget those who bring this disaster to this nation by applauding the evils done under the name of the National Forces.⁵¹⁶

Refi Cevad argued that the actions of the Nationalists prepared the ground for disaster of the Allied occupation of İstanbul. He also criticized severely those who supported the national organization due to their tolerations to the Nationalists.

Hakimiyet-i Milliye made the following comments on the Allied occupation of İstanbul:

... Britain will not hesitate to announce that the Government and the Caliphate are satisfied with this occupation. Indeed, it clearly proves this argument that any newspaper is not allowed to write even a line, which supports the national rights, except for rag newspapers of sold and despicable persons who do not avoide publishing immediately in accordance with the British orders and approval on in İstanbul and these rag newspapers constantly continue to publish sinister publications satisfying of the actions of our enemies...⁵¹⁷

Sempozyumu I, 23-25 Mayıs Bildirileri, Vol. I, (İstanbul: Üsküdar Belediye Başkanlığı Üsküdar Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2004), pp. 207-209.

⁵¹⁶ *Alemdar*, No.457-2757, 19 Mart 1336 [19.03.1920], p. 1.

⁵¹⁷ *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, No.17, 23 Mart 1336 [23.03.1920], p. 2.

As it is seen that the newspaper criticized the silence of the İstanbul press in the face of the occupation with this interpretation, and at the same time, it indicated the British influence on the press. Moreover, *Hamiyet-i Milliye* put forward the following thoughts about what Britain intend with the occupation of İstanbul:

...The British Government was not willing to give up the ambitions that it had long been grown to separate İstanbul from the Turks, to differentiate the posts of Caliphate and the Sultanate neither from each other, nor to dominate İstanbul and it envisaged to dominate (İstanbul) actually by forcing in order to establish a patronage there.⁵¹⁸

With this comments, the newspaper showed that the Allied occupation of İstanbul was related to the old political dreams of Britain. According to the paper, the British policymakers devoted themselves to take İstanbul under their control and to establish their own authorities.

A report taken from the French press discussed the Eastern politics of the British. According to the news, before the occupation of İstanbul, “the British authorities wanted the Government to arrest Grand Vizier and the Minister of War in Turkey since they forced the Turks to accept the terms of the peace treaty.” However, the newspaper said it is very extreme action. Therefore, the newspaper thought “that the occupation of İstanbul was closely related to the eastern policy of Britain. That is, this time, the Britain intended to force the Turks to accept the provisions of the peace treaty by occupying of İstanbul.”⁵¹⁹ According to news, “this is not a new development because İstanbul had already been occupied by the Allied powers for sixteen months and they had a great fleet in front of İstanbul.” Towards the end of the news, the newspaper supported “that Trakya, İzmir, İstanbul and Kurdistan

⁵¹⁸ Ibid., p. 2.

⁵¹⁹ Indeed, the occupation of İstanbul was coincided with the time when the national movement became very powerful and expanded rapidly all over the country. Under these circumstances, they would not accept a treaty included had heavy conditions. The documents of the British General Staff also confirmed that the nationalists had a great influence on Anatolia. The situation in Turkey in a memorandum of the General Staff dated March 15, was described as follows: “Political power has been transferred to the hands of the Nationalists... All of the nations are certainly disgusted with the war. But the people... are ready to fight relentlessly to prevent their lands from being broken up and handed over to the Greeks or Armenians. ...Resistance is increasing in accordance with the volume of the occupied territory... The Turks are extraordinary fighters... Time is in favor of Mustafa Kemal. Possible consequences of offering a heavy contract: a) Avoidance of confirmation; b) Establishing a new government in Atolia with escape of the parliament to there ...” Jaeschke, *İngiliz Belgeleri*, pp. 151-152.

should be left in the hands of the Turks. Since this program was not implemented, the problem became complicated and the İstanbul Government lost its effectiveness.’’⁵²⁰

Yet another French newspaper, published in *İzmir’e Doğru*, attributed the reason for the occupation of İstanbul to the imperialist eastern policy of the Britain. To the newspaper, “it was not possible to ignore that the Britain had increased their forces along the coast of the Caspian Sea and along the Batum-Baku line, they had dominated Iran and Iraq-Elchezire, and had also improved their form of transport with India.” The journal also evaluated the developments in relation to İstanbul as follows:

...the British had already possession of the beginning of a separate line from Basra. Now, it seized the last part of the mentioned line, namely İstanbul (Dersaadet). At that time, the future of İstanbul was very closely related to the implementation of this imperialist program. In an atmosphere that these international thoughts and conditions prevail, İstanbul was occupied with a fait accompli made by Lloyd George to France and Italy...⁵²¹

Hakimiyet-i Milliye quoted important news from *Le Temps* on April 20, 1920. The French newspaper rejected the British claim that Turks were responsible for killing of Armenians in Cilicia and its environment. Instead, this paper displayed the Armenians as the real responsables for the events of Cilica. The news revealed the truth as follows:

There are too much noises beyond of the Manche (referred to the British), relevant to that ‘Turks are killing Armenians in Maraş, but the French Government had made no statement about the existence of the massacres’. According to the report, ‘the incidents resulted from being indulged of Armenians against the Muslim community and what happened in Maraş was not a massacre.’⁵²²

In the following of the news, it is indicated that “Armenian attacks were concentrated in Muslim neighborhoods in the night of 7-8 April, and the Director of the American College in Gaziantep confirmed that those who caused the events were Armenians. All of these events started to expand in the middle of April and exercise the control over the region.” As it can be understood that the French press clearly denied the allegations of the British Government about being killed Armenians in Maraş.

⁵²⁰ *İzmir’e Doğru*, No.51, 7 Nisan 1336 [07.04.1920], p. 2. From *Le Temps*.

⁵²¹ *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, No.28, 9 Mayıs 1336 [09.05.1920], p. 2. From *L’Humanite*.

⁵²² *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, No.23, 20 Nisan 1336 [20.04.1920], p. 3. From *Le Temps*.

According to another report of *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, the Allied occupation of İstanbul was a result of the eastern policies of Britain, and the occupation was realized by the instruction of British Government. The paper elucidated the situation with the following statements:

The occupation of İstanbul was fulfilled by the order of the British General Milen. This attempt made by Milen is in fact suited to the politics of the Entente Powers because they preferred to take military intervention instead of making agreement with the Nationalists in Anatolia. The occupation forces in İstanbul put the Ottoman Empire in to a position that they could exert heavy pressure on the armies and naval forces to be inevitably inactivated in accordance with the conditions of the Armistice.This occupation led to take place events that spread very rapidly in Cilicia and its periphery.⁵²³

These statements were also important in terms of showing the right of the National Forces to resist against the occupations. The Nationalists were aware of the real desires of the Allied powers, especially Britain. They saw that Britain wanted to hogtie and subjugated the Turkish people. The Nationalists could not accept the captivity; hence they started resistance against the occupying forces to achieve the independence and integrity of their country.

According to another narration of *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, the Britain had an intended to cause an internal disturbance by occupying of İstanbul. The newspaper put emphasis on that “the British Government plans to strangle the awakening of Islamic world by occupying of İstanbul. It desires to perish us into a civil war in order to conquer the castle from inside.”⁵²⁴

In addition to the news of *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* mentioned above published, *Öğüt* narrated the occupation of İstanbul with the following comments:

It will not be possible to linking the occupation of İstanbul to a deception such as ‘reinforcement of the power of the Caliph...’ as the British put forward. ...They (the British) are based on their own bayonets, but being unified is also a great source of strength. The Islamic union will not remain silent, and soon it will throw of its deadness and silence.⁵²⁵

⁵²³ *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, No.30, 17 Mayıs 1336 [17.05.1920], p. 2. From *Le Temps*.

⁵²⁴ *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, No.30, 13 Mayıs 1336 [13.05.1920], p. 1.

⁵²⁵ *Öğüt*, No.336, 14 Nisan 1336 [14.04.1920], p. 1. The reason for reaction of *Öğüt* against the allegations of the British based on the explanations of Allies. Because when Allies occupied the city, they published a declaration. “The occupation administration especially specified that the decision

The Allied powers had put forward that “the occupation of İstanbul would consolidate the authority of the Caliph-Sultan” in their proclamation declared on March 16, 19120. They, most probably, abstained from the reactions of Islamic world because the occupation of center of Caliphate would not be approved by the Muslim countries. Accordingly, the newspaper did not believe that the statements of the Allies reflected the truth and it called all Muslim countries to take the action, and to come together against the enemies of Islam.

The last news about the Allied occupation of İstanbul came from Russia. Bolsheviks supported the resistance of the Nationalists against the imperialists. Also, Soviet Russia severely criticized the Allied occupation of İstanbul, and they put emphasis that İstanbul belonged to Muslims. The details of the news are as follows:

...the contract related to the occupation of İstanbul by force, which had been issued by the collapsed Tsarist, was torn and destroyed. ...İstanbul will remain in the hands of Muslims. The agreement, related to the division of Turkey and the formation of an Armenia on Turkish territory, was torn and ruined....⁵²⁶

As final words, the Allied powers decided to reoccupy İstanbul, which had been under de facto Allied occupation for sixteen months, on March 10, 1920, at the First Conference of London. Although they put forward the pretext of killing of Armenians by Turks in Maraş, they feared the declaration of the National Pact and they interpreted it a revolt against the Allied presence in Turkey. Meanwhile, the İstanbul and Anatolian press gave wide coverage to the occupation of İstanbul. The anti-nationalist press in İstanbul claimed that the Allied intervention resulted from the actions of the Nationalists. However, the nationalist press in İstanbul, in fact, in Anatolia emphasized that the Allied occupation was related to both the activities of the Nationalists and the eastern policies of Britain. According to the nationalist newspapers, the British authorities planned to break the influence of the Nationalists on the central government and to reassure the ligature of the Muslim population with the occupation of İstanbul and taking the Sultan as hostage.

of the occupation was a measure to ensure the security of the Sultan, Entente Powers and the population in general.” See Bozkurt, *Ibid.*, p. 325.

⁵²⁶ *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, No.29, 13 Mayıs 1336 [13.05.1920], p. 2.

Furthermore, the nationalist newspapers published proclamations displaying the legitimate effect of the Allied occupation of İstanbul on the National Struggle. It is clear that the occupation of İstanbul had produced negative results as well as positive results. As the most important of these positive results, the occupation paved the way of the establishment of the GNA in Anatolia. In this way, the organization representing the national sovereignty was established and the Representative Committee was real representative of Turkish homeland.

3.2.3. Fatwas of Ankara and İstanbul Concerning Legitimacy of the National Struggle

After the occupation of İstanbul, the Government of Salih Pasha could not perform its duty freely because the Allied powers constantly intervened in the affairs of the Government. In fact, Salih Pasha was now undesirable for Allies because he and his Cabinet did not accept British pressure to condemn the nationalist movement publicly. In his response to the British memorandum dated on March 26, he insisted that the movements under the name of the National Forces in Anatolia were the defense of legitimate rights. However, the High Commissioners in İstanbul repeated the same requests by giving a new memorandum on March 31, 1920. Salih Hulusi Pasha could not stand against the external pressures and he was forced to resign on April 2, 1920.⁵²⁷ The press in İstanbul attributed the fall of the Salih Pasha cabinet to his closeness to the National Forces. In addition, the press argued that the situation of ministers was on shaky ground since a long time, especially since the occupation of İstanbul. In this regard, the British-backed *Bosphore* published in İstanbul commented on the change of Government:

The Government did not condemn the national movement; it only expressed that the National Forces engaged in radical attempts. On the contrary, the fact that Damat Ferid's government claimed that he would isolate Anatolia from the weapon

⁵²⁷ Criss, *Ibid.*, pp. 66-67; Jaeschke, *İngiliz Belgeleri*, p. 153; *Peyam-ı Sabah*, No.94, 4 Nisan 1336 [04.04.1920], p. 1; *Yeni Gün*, No.372, 4 Nisan 1336 [04.04.1920], p. 1. Essentially, Salih Pasha was one of the people who had made great efforts to resolve the disputes between the Government and the Nationalists. Even though Allied powers wanted him to reject and condemn the National Forces, he did not do it. In this period, he could cooperate with Ankara. See Tefvik Bıyıklıoğlu, *Atatürk Anadolu'da*, (Ankara: Kent Basımevi, 1981), p. 130; Tansel, *Ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 36; Gökbilgin, *Ibid.*, p. 626.

in a real sense, and would dispose of the national movement and also would try to push the conditions of peace treaty, which would be given, on the nation prepared the ground for this change.⁵²⁸

The reconciliatory stance of Salih Pasha would not be conformed to the imperialist policies of the Allied powers and especially Britain. They needed one who would move in their direction; or he was Damat Ferid Pasha. Subsequently, Damat Ferid Pasha came to power on April 4, 1920, and then the pressure on the Nationalists returned in full force.⁵²⁹ In the Imperial Decree dated on April 5, which was read in front of a British Captain, the purpose of the establishment of the Damat Ferid Pasha cabinet was clearly stated. However, the Sultan claimed that Damat Ferid Pasha had been appointed as the Grand Vizier due to his capability and ability of cognizance. Moreover, the Sultan wanted him to prevent the ‘disorder occurred under the name of national movement’, and to enforce the necessary legal sanctions on those causing the turmoil, and to restore order and peace in the country.⁵³⁰

The Ferid Pasha cabinet was gladly welcomed by the press which was opponent the National Forces. Even Ali Kemal gave advises to Damat Ferid and he wanted Ferid Pasha to utilize the opportunity and to form the Cabinet from moderate and impartial people.⁵³¹ In another report, Ali Kemal wrote “that the Government of Damat Ferid Pasha is the most powerful of the governments we have ever seen.”⁵³² Refi Cevat also pointed out the politics that Ferid Pasha would apply in his article in *Alemdar*. He said for Ferid Pasha that “he will be strict as far as Köprülü Mehmet Pasha, and he will be prufier as far as Kuyucu Murat Pasha, and he will be visionary as far as Sokullu Mehmet Pasha.”⁵³³ Refi Cevad appreciated the Government like that “We are pleased with the Government's activities and we praise to it...”⁵³⁴

Hakimiyet-i Milliye, the media organ of the National movement in Ankara, was not pleased with the Ferid Pasha cabinet and the paper claimed that the Britain played an

⁵²⁸ *Yeni Gün*, No.373, 5 Nisan 1336 [05.04.1920], p. 1. From *Bosphore*.

⁵²⁹ Bıyıklıoğlu, *Ibid.*, p. 130; *Peyam-ı Sabah*, No.94, 4 Nisan 1336 [04.04.1920], p. 1; *Vakit*, No.865, 5 Nisan 1336 [05.04.1920], p. 1.

⁵³⁰ *TV*, No.3820, 5 Nisan 1336 [05.04.1920], p. 1; Sarıhan, *Kurtuluş Savaşı Günlüğü*, Vol. II, p. 410.

⁵³¹ *Peyam-ı Sabah*, No.94, 4 Nisan 1336 [04.04.1920], p. 1.

⁵³² *Peyam-ı Sabah*, No.106, 16 Nisan 1336 [16.04.1920], p. 1.

⁵³³ *Alemdar*, No.472-2772, 4 Nisan1336 [04.04.1920], p. 1.

⁵³⁴ *Alemdar*, No.483-2783, 15 Nisan 1336 [15.04.1920], p. 1.

important role in the fall of the Salih Pasha cabinet and in the coming of power of Damat Ferid Pasha. The newspaper made following comments on the issue:

According to the British plan, Ferid Pasha had to be brought to power immediately after the occupation of İstanbul. However, Salih Pasha, who had a weak cabinet under difficult conditions, showed persistence to stay in his post place despite the fact that the Government did not have any positive work. This situation faltered Britain for three to five days. ...They turned all their artilleries and guns towards the Sublime Port and the Salih Pasha cabinet fell. In turn, Ferid Pasha, the instrument of Britain, came to establish new government. ...All human beings appreciate, and especially our own nation knows very well that all of them are the British intrigues. ...Nidering Ferid Pasha is who will find solace only with the ruin of our homeland and our nation.⁵³⁵

In addition, Mustafa Kemal Pasha showed the greatest reaction to assigning of Damat Ferid to re-establish the Government. In the circular published in *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, he said that “...we circularize not to recognize in any case that Damat Ferid Pasha and his cabinet, which their traitorisms are certain and charged with the bayonet of enemy.”⁵³⁶ All of these statements proved that coming of Damat Ferid Pasha into power broke all mutual trust and cooperation and reconciliatory atmosphere which had been formed between İstanbul and Ankara during the Ali Rıza Pasha and Salih Pasha cabinets.

Damat Ferid Pasha began his operations against the National movement without wasting time. On April 11, 1920, he issued a proclamation that contained provisions vilifying the Nationalists and the national organization. The anti-nationalists newspapers, such as *Alemdar* and *Peyam-ı Sabah* and the official newspaper *Takvim-i Vekayi* also shared this proclamation in their columns. For example, *Alemdar* provided following information about the content of the proclamation:

It was elaborated that “the Ottoman State was in an unprecedented danger and it was required to follow a policy, suitable for the necessities of the time, in order to get rid of this evil situation.” Moreover, according to the proclamation of the Government, Mustafa Kemal Pasha and his friends, who supposed that the liberation of the country would be provided by the armed struggle, posed a great obstacle for ‘Ferid Pasha’ politics, promising to save the homeland’. On this point, Damad Ferid

⁵³⁵ *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, No.20, 10 Nisan 1336 [10.04.1920], p. 1.

⁵³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 4. For further information, See Atatürk’ün Tamim, Telgraf ve Beyannameleri, pp. 298-299.

mentioned that “some people, who were unable to realize the extraordinary situation in the country, had brought the political situation to an extremely dangerous position by creating actions of incitement and mischief in the country under the name of ‘National Organization’ only for the sake of their ambitions and interests.” Also, the ‘shameful events’ of those moved under the name of the national organization had led to turn completely European and American public opinion against us and caused to make the conditions of the peace treaty even heavier. In addition to these, Damat Ferid Pasha considered “Mustafa Kemal Pasha as ‘the ringleader of insurrection’ and defined his attempt to cutting of communications and relations between the central Government and Anatolia after the occupation of İstanbul as the greatest treason.” Ferid Pasha underlined in the proclamation that “the national organization had caused a great disaster by ‘separating the head of the state from its body and by exposing Anatolia to the invasion.” For this reason, the greatest enemies of the Ottoman subjects were the Nationalists. Damat Ferid Pasha described the National Forces as those who disregarding the Constitution and the laws of the state, who collecting money by force from the people, and who forcefully conscripting the citizens. End of the proclamation, it is emphasized that “all these acts, done by the Nationalists, should be punished because they acted against orders of the God and Islamic law.”⁵³⁷

It can be inferred from the proclamation that Ferid Pasha declared that the Nationalists and their practices were not legitimate with respect to legal and religious aspects. He argued that the Nationalist leaders acted against the Constitution and laws of the state. Additionally, he put forward that they did not obey the will of the Sultan-Caliph and Islamic law and they led to prevailing of incitement and mischief in the country. Apart from these claims, Ferid Pasha cabinet wanted to discredit the Nationalists in the eyes of the people. That’s why; the Government described the Nationalists as the brigands or gangs, who rob goods of the people and killing them. With this proclamation, Ferid Pasha, who wanted to preserve the homeland, had

⁵³⁷ *TV*, No.3824, 11 Nisan 1336 [11.04.1920], p. 1; *Alemdar*, No.479-2779, 11 Nisan 1336 [11.04.1920], p. 1; *Peyam-ı Sabah*, No.101, 11 Nisan 1336 [11.04.1920], p. 1. Also See *Yeni Gün*; No.379, 11 Nisan 1336 [11.04.1920], p. 1; *Vakit*, No.871, 11 Nisan 1336 [11.04.1920], p. 1. For the copyright source, See Zekai Güner-Orhan Kabataş, *Milli Mücadele Dönemi Beyannameleri ve Basını*, (Ankara: Atatürk Kültür Merkezi Yayını, 1990), pp. 202-203.

fulfilled the demand of the British authorities that the Nationalists should be disavowed. As it can be remembered that they had asked Salih Pasha cabinet to do same thing; however, he denied their demand. Ferid Pasha was ready to move in accordance with the orders of the Allied powers, particularly Britain.

Furthermore, the İstanbul Government did not hesitated to use the religion as weapon to deceive pure people of Anatolia. Fatwas were the most important propaganda elements used by the İstanbul Government to encourage the Muslim people of Anatolia to revolt against the National movement. The Government of Damat Ferid Pasha, not satisfied with aforementioned proclamation, also published a Fatwa on April 11, 1920, to demolish the Anatolian union and to dissolve the organization of the National Forces.⁵³⁸ The Fatwa, which regarded the members of National movement as rebels, was prepared by Shayk al-Islam Dürri Efendi⁵³⁹ and this religious declaration was consisted of five different sections complementing each other. The essence of them depended on “the insurrection against the Sultan”. In this way, the Government tried to make the Fatwa legal because the “*Obedience to the Sovereign*” was required, and the confronting the orders of the Sovereign was interpreted as ‘religionless’. Therefore, it was defined that the the movement of the National Forces were composed of those who opened the red flag against the Sultan and they had no legitimate base in terms of religious way.⁵⁴⁰

According to the anti-nationalist journal *Alemdar*, the Fatwa covered the following provisions: In the first section, the National Forces was categorized as *the forces of brigand* and it was emphasized that “they were deceiving the loyal subject of the Sultan and collecting troops contrary to the order of the Sultan, and laws of the state.” Also, the Fatwa balmed the leaders of the National Forces for torturing the people and for extorting their goods, and for preventing to be executed the orders of

⁵³⁸ *TV*, No.3824, 11 Nisan 1336 [11.04.1920], p. 1; *Alemdar*, No.479-2779, 11 Nisan 1336 [11.04.1920], p. 1; *Peyam-ı Sabah*, No.101, 11 Nisan 1336 [11.04.1920], p. 1.

⁵³⁹ Dürri Efendi, who was the son of Mehmet Dürri Efendi, the Kadi-asker of Rumelia, was appointed to Shayk-al Islam in the fourth Ferid Pasha cabinet on April 5, 1920. He continued his duty until July 31, 1920, when the Damat Ferid Pasha cabinet withdrew from the power. After the victory of the National Struggle, he fled abroad by the end of 1922, and later he went to Emir Şerif Hüseyin in Hijaz and he died there in 1923. See Abdülkadir Altunsu, *Osmanlı Şeyhülislamı*, (Ankara: Ayyıldız Matbaası A.Ş., 1972), p. 264.

⁵⁴⁰ Osman Akandere-Hasan Ali Polat, *Damat Ferit Paşa Hükümetlerinin Milli Mücadele Karşısı Politikaları*, (Ankara: AAMY, 2011), p. 127-129.

the state in Anatolia by separating İstanbul from Anatolia. According to the second section of the Fatwa, “the bad guys, namely the Nationalists, undermined the glory of Caliphate and betrayed him by disobeying the rules.” These “mutineers” disrupted the public order and encouraged the people to create trouble of the state. Moreover, it was certainly decided that “if these rebels (the Nationalists) do not obey the order given for their disintegration, and if they still continue to do evil, then it would be a holy duty to kill them and to save the people from their evils.” In addition, it was advised in this section that “all the Muslims who had the power to fight in the country had to be gathered around the Caliph-Sultan, and it was a religious obligation to fight with the *brigands*, called themselves the Nationalists, by complying with the Imperial Will of the Sultan.” The third section of the Fatwa expressed that “if the soldiers, who appointed by the Sultan to struggle with the Nationalists, avoided fighting with them, they would be treated with heavy punishment in the world, and also they would suffer great sorrow in the Hereafter.” In the fourth section, it was interpreted that fighting against the National Forces was regarded as a ‘sacred duty’. It was announced as good news that “if the soldiers of the Sultan, assigned to combat against the Nationalists, killed the Nationalists, they would be Ghazi; if these soldiers were killed by the Nationalists, they would be martyred.” In the last section of the Fatwa, Dürriade Abdullah Efendi declared that “Muslims who did not struggle with the National Forces would be regarded as sinful and criminal, and they would be punished according to the provisions of Sharia.”⁵⁴¹

As it can be seen that Fatwa of Dürriade Abdullah Efendi described the Anatolian movement not only as an uprising against “the Sultan”, and but also a movement against ‘the religion’, and also declared Mustafa Kemal Pasha with his friends as “traitor”. It is very clear that the Nationalists were denigrated in every line of the Fatwa. Also, it stressed that killing the Nationalists, persecuting the loyal subjects of the Sultan, was holy duty by force of religious rules.⁵⁴² As a matter of fact, the Fatwa tried to put emphasis on that the whole nation, especially the Sultan, was not a

⁵⁴¹ *Alemdar*, No.479-2779, 11 Nisan 1336 [11.04.1920], p. 1; *Peyam-ı Sabah*, No.101, 11 Nisan 1336 [11.04.1920], p. 1; *Tasvir-i Efkar*, No.3022, 11 Nisan 1336 [11.04.1920], p. 1. For further information about the Fatwa of the İstanbul Government, See Ali Sarıkoyuncu, *Milli Mücadelede Din Adamları, Vol. I*, (Ankara: Diyanet İşleri Başkanlığı Yayını, 2007), p. 177; Altunsu, *Ibid.*, pp. 262-263; Akandere-Polat, *Ibid.*, pp. 129-132.

⁵⁴² Akandere-Polat, *Ibid.*, pp. 132-133; Sarıkoyuncu, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 177.

supporter of this struggle; that's why, the National movement was not a legitimate act in terms of both religious and legal aspects.

Later on, tens of thousands of this Fatwa were printed and distributed all over the country by using of British and Greek planes in some places. It is crucial in terms of displaying that Ferid Pasha was relied on which power and what kinds of methods he resorted to destroy the National Struggle.⁵⁴³

Above all else, the legitimate aspect of the Fatwa, which declared the National movement as illegitimate movement, is controversial issue. It can be perceived that the Fatwa of Dürrizade Abdullah Efendi was not an output of natural process. In other words, it can be understood that this Fatwa had not rested on true religious base. It was asserted that this Fatwa was brought into force by the oppression of the British authorities although Gotthard Jaeschke put emphasis on that “there is nothing in the Documents of the British Foreign Office to support this claim”.⁵⁴⁴ However, there are important evidences that strengthen the assumption of the British intervention in creating of the Fatwa. Related to this issue, *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* published the speech delivered in the GNA on April 27, 1920, by Fevzi Pasha, who crossed to Anatolia and participated in the National movement after the occupation of İstanbul. According to newspaper, Fevzi Pasha said that “... Finally, by putting our Sultan under this pressure, they took a fatwa, which would cause to pit brother against brother.”⁵⁴⁵ In addition to confessions of Fevzi Pasha, Eşref Edip Bey said that creating of the Fatwa stemmed from the British oppression and torment:

In those days, the pressure of the Britain has increased. They had forced to be published a fatwa about the illegitimacy of the National movement that started to develop in Anatolia. In that time, Shayk-al Islam was Haydarizade İbrahim Efendi. Shayk-al Islam left his duty by not giving the fatwa, the English wanted. Then, Dürrizade Abdullah Efendi was assigned to Shayk-al Islam. Abdullah Efendi, a

⁵⁴³ In his book called Tek Adam, Şevket Süreyya Aydemir describes the issue of announcing of fatwas to Anatolia as follows: “Greek planes were scattering these sacred fatwas of the Caliph the Anatolian heavens. British torpedoes, British consuls, Rums and Armenian organizations and Greek forces conveyed the fatwas of the Chaliph, which provoked the Muslims each other, to Anatolia.” See Aydemir, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 286.

⁵⁴⁴ Jaeschke, *İngiliz Belgeleri*, p. 153.

⁵⁴⁵ *Hâkimiyet-i Milliye*, No.26, 1 Mayıs 1336 [01.05.1920], pp. 2-3.

human being who can submit himself to every desire, gave these fatwa under the exorbitant persecution and oppression of the occupying forces.⁵⁴⁶

All of these arguments showed that the Fatwa itself has not rested on religious legitimate base. It was a political document that had been prepared at the point of the British weapon.

After the Fatwa had been announced, the anti-nationalist press started to give support to the Fatwa defining the National Forces as “disbelievers”. For example, in the article written published in *Alemdar* Refi Cevad said that “history repeats itself. The Sultan Murat IV had also defeated them (rebels) holding a fatwa in his one hand and a sword in the other hand. Such enemies of religion and state are extinguished just like that.”⁵⁴⁷ In another report from *Alemdar*, it was argued that those who do not obey the Sultan and his Government will be cursed by both the God and history.⁵⁴⁸ In this way, the pure and clean religious feelings of the Turkish people were exploited for political plans. In another news published in the *Alemdar*, the Nationalists were defined as “dajjal”. The article emphasized that “the Nationalists resume again their brutality, looting and banditry as they had done during the period of Great War.”⁵⁴⁹ *Peyam-ı Sabah* also supported the Fatwa: “The false national action is opposed to the Sharia.”⁵⁵⁰ The Important news supported to the Fatwa was published again by Ali Kemal in *Peyam-ı Sabah*. He criticized the Nationalists and supported the practices of the Government with the following statements:

...What is the national duty that fall to the real Turks, the Turk of the son of the Turk, the Ottomans against the situation? Is not it to get rid of those men (Nationalists) and to clean our poor homeland from those stained? By seeing these facts with an object lesson, if Anatolian Turks bring these buffoons into line soon by following the provisions of Sharia and imperial order of the Sultan, they will understand how the world looks like.⁵⁵¹

⁵⁴⁶ Akandere-Polat, Ibid., pp. 134-135.

⁵⁴⁷ *Alemdar*, No.480-2780, 12 Nisan 1336 [12.04.1920], p. 1.

⁵⁴⁸ *Alemdar*, No.498-2798, 30 Nisan 1336 [30.04.1920], p. 1.

⁵⁴⁹ *Alemdar*, No.509-2809, 11 Mayıs 1336 [11.05.1920], p. 1.

⁵⁵⁰ *Peyam-ı Sabah*, No.101, 11 Nisan 1336 [11.04.1920], p. 1.

⁵⁵¹ “...Vaziyete karşı gerçek Türklere, Türkoğlu Türklere, Osmanlılara düşen milli görev nedir? Bu adamlardan (milliyetçiler) yakamızı kurtarmak, şu zavallı vatanımızı bu lekelilerden temizlemek değil midir? Bu gerçekleri ibretle görerek Anadolu Türkleri Şeriat hükmüne, Padişah'ın fermanına uyup bu şaklabanlara hadlerini yakında bildirirse dünyayı ve Konya'yı anlamış olurlar.” *Peyam-ı Sabah*, No.103, 13 Nisan 1336 [13.04.1920], p. 1.

As it is seen that Ali Kemal thought that it was necessary to get rid of the Nationalists, who were harmful for the country. Also, he expected that the people condemned the Nationalists by relying on the Sharia rule and Will of the Sultan.

On the other hand, *İrade-i Milliye* criticized the Fatwa of Dürrizade and it expressed that the Fatwa was not accredited by Anatolia. The journal shared the following arguments: “It is reported that the Government in İstanbul, which is under their hands and orders of the English, issued some fatwas against the National organization by force. ...However, it is doubtless that such enterprises will not be able to have even the smallest value in the eyes of the already vigilant people and the public opinion.”⁵⁵²

These developments, which had caused the desertion of many soldiers from the National Forces, prompted the Nationalists to take measures and solutions to prevent these dangerous developments. In this regard, the Commander of the fifty-sixteenth Army Division Colonel Bekir Sami Bey (Günsav) was the first warned the Nationalist leaders in Ankara. He sent a telegraph to Ankara on April 12, 1920, elucidating that the Fatwa of Dürrizade was published in İstanbul newspapers and that the supporters of the National movement were accused of religionless and disbeliever in the Fatwa. He also drew attention to the approaching danger with these words: “If you do not get urgently the required counter-fatwas by the Chief Müfti of Ankara and Islamic scholars in this night, it is very likely that the very dangerous circumstances will happen in the provinces of Bursa and Balıkesir.”⁵⁵³ With this telegraph, he urged Ankara to take urgently the necessary precautions against the harmful events.

The leaders of the National Forces decided that the most effective measure against the Fatwa of the İstanbul Government was a counter Fatwa. Thereupon, a counter Fatwa was prepared by a delegation consisting of twenty members under the chairmanship of Mehmet Rifat (Börekçi) Efendi,⁵⁵⁴ who was Müfti of Ankara and

⁵⁵² *İrade-i Milliye*, No.37, 19 Nisan 1336 [19.04.1920], p. 2.

⁵⁵³ Akandere-Polat, *Ibid.*, p. 143.

⁵⁵⁴ Mehmet Rifat Efendi was born in Ankara in 1860. His father was Ali Kazım Efendi from Börekçizadeler, and his mother was Habibe Hanım. Rifat Efendi, who married Samiye (Börekçi) Hanım, had three sons named Raşit, M. Fuat and Ziya. After completing his primary and secondary

Chairman of SDR of Ankara.⁵⁵⁵ This Fatwa, which was consisted of five sections, was prepared on April 14, 1920, and sent to be approved of muftis and religious men in Anatolia on April 16, 1920. Also, Mustafa Kemal kindly requested that the civil and military authorities to help receiving approval of religious men. The Fatwa of Ankara was approved by many muftis of provinces and district, and this situation was reported to Ankara by telegram. The list of names of approximately one hundred fifty two muftis, who affirmed the Fatwa of Rifat Efendi, was published on different dates in *İrade-i Milliye* and *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*.⁵⁵⁶

İrade-i Milliye published the Fatwa of Rifat Efendi on April 22, 1920, without making any comment on it. It is clear that Mehmet Rifat Efendi and the group of scholars were attentive to displaying that the views of Dürrizade were very wrong, and that those who prepared the Fatwa of İstanbul Government were in a great evil according to Sharia rule. According to the newspaper, the Fatwa of Ankara, which was consisted of five parts like that of İstanbul, was a complete response to the Fatwa of the İstanbul Government. It refuted the provisions of Dürrizade in each section. The first section of the Fatwa, the longest part, included following statements: “The Sublime Port and Ministry of War, which was in charge of equipping the Army of Islam, was seized and in this way, the Caliph was precluded to take precautions for the real interests of the nation.” A martial law was proclaimed and court-martials were formed, and also the right of the Caliph for

education, Mehmet Rifat Efendi went to İstanbul for higher education. He received lectures from Atif Efendi, one of the Bayezit Madrasa's professors, and deserved to take diploma by completing the education in religious high sciences and technical sciences. Rifat Efendi, who also knew Arabic and Persian languages, had also obtained the ratification (icazet) from Kütükçüoğlu Rifat Efendi, who was one of ulema of Ankara. He was appointed to his main duty, the Mufti of Ankara on November 25, 1908. Rifat Efendi, who faithfully supported the National Struggle, founded the SDR of Ankara with his friends, and was elected Chairman of the Society. After the GNA had been convened on April 23, 1920,, he entered the Assembly as a deputy of Menteşe. However, he resigned from his deputies and continued his main duty of Mufti. After the Presidency of Religious Affairs was established on April 4, 1924, Rifat Efendi was appointed to its Presidency. In the period of the Presidency of Religious Affairs, he published two important works, such as “Hak Dini Kur’an Dili Meali and Sahih-i Buhari”. Rifat Efendi, who took the surname of “Börekcı” after surname law, maintained his duty as the President of the Religious Affairs until March 5, 1941. Abdurrahman Kaplan, “Milli Mücadele Dönemi ve Sonrasında Mehmet Rifat (Börekcı) Efendi”, (U.M.T.), (Erzurum: Atatürk Üniversitesi, 2010), pp. 8-11.

⁵⁵⁵ Günay Çağlar, “Milli Mücadele’de Fetvalar Olayına Değişik Bir Açıdan Bakış”, *Atatürk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 75. Yıl Özel Sayısı, No. 11 (1999), p. 267.

⁵⁵⁶ *İrade-i Milliye*, No.38, 22 Nisan 1336 [22.04.1920], p. 1; *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, No.27, 5 Mayıs 1336 [05.05.1920], p. 1; Çağlar, *Ibid.*, p. 268.

jurisdiction was limited by applying the British laws. “Although the Caliph did not consent, the enemies occupied the Ottoman lands like İzmir, Adana, Maraş, Antep and Urfa, and they attempted to destroy the Muslims there, and to loot their goods.” That’s why, according to Fatwa, all Muslims were obliged to rescue the Caliph, who had suffered an affront and taken captured. In the second section of the Fatwa, it was elucidated that according to Sharia rule, “the people of Islam, who were trying to save the Caliphate and to clean up the actually occupied territories from the enemies, would not be considered as separated from the path of Allah.” Therefore, they would not be considered equal with disbelievers. In the third section, it was explicitly said “that if these Muslims (the National Forces) die in the fighting with the enemy, they become Martyr, and if they survive, they become Ghazi.” The fourth part, the Fatwa of Ankara put emphasis on that the Muslims, who struggled to rescue the country from the enemy invasion, could not be regarded as rebels or brigands. The fifth and last section of the Fatwa of Ankara, it was put forward that the Sultan-Caliph was taken captured and “the Fatwa of İstanbul Government was issued by force and pressure of enemies; hence, the provisions of this Fatwa were invalid, and also it was not permissible to adhere to this Fatwa in accordance with Sharia.”⁵⁵⁷ It is interesting that newspapers in Anatolia did not make comments on the Fatwa of Ankara. They were contended with publishing the given text.

As it can be seen that Rifat Efendi insistently emphasized that the Nationalists were neither disbelievers nor rebels in terms of religious and legal aspects. These patriotic people made great effort to liberate the Sultan-Caliph and the homeland from the captivity of enemies. Additionally, the Fatwa of İstanbul Government was issued at the point of the British bayonet and. That is, there was no free Sultan-Caliph, whom the National Forces were able to revolt against. Therefore, the Nationalists could not be described as rebels, brigands or gangs. In addition, the Fatwa of Ankara put forward that it was imperative for all Muslims to rescue the Sultan-Caliphate and that it was necessary duty to fight against the real enemy, namely the Greek forces; not

⁵⁵⁷ *İrade-i Milliye*, No.38, 22 Nisan 1336 [22.04.1920], p. 1; *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, No.27, 5 Mayıs 1336 [05.05.1920], p. 1; *Açıksöz*, No.44, 25 Nisan 1336 [25.04.1920], p. 1. For further information about the Fatwa of Rifat Efendi, See Necdet Aysal, “Türkiye’de İslami Düşüncenin Örgütlenmesi ve Hedefleri (31 Mart Olayı’ndan DP’nin İktidara Gelişine Kadar, 1909-1950)”, (U.D.D.), (Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi, 2004), pp. 196-197; Sarıkoyuncu, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 151-153.

against the National Forces. As it is seen that Rifat Efendi refuted the Fatwa of Dürriade in every aspect by coming up with reasonable provisions and he proved that it had no religious value in accordance with Sharia. In this way, the Fatwa of Ankara approved that the Anatolian movement had religious and legal legitimacy.

It is necessary to mention that the İstanbul press did not publish any news about the Fatwa of Ankara or activities of the Nationalists because of the censorship of the Ferid Pasha cabinet.

3.3. Relations of Ankara-İstanbul After Opening of the Grand National Assembly

3.3.1. Legal and Political Importance of the Grand National Assembly

With the occupation of İstanbul, the Britain humiliated the Ottoman Government and, unintentionally, they had removed from a great obstacle in front of Mustafa Kemal Pasha.⁵⁵⁸ Sultan Vahdettin repealed the Ottoman Parliament on April 11, 1920, with the Imperial Decree. Moreover, he invited the whole nation to gather around the sultanate. He announced that the Assembly was annulled again, and the elections would be held within four months.⁵⁵⁹ All of these gave a new opportunity to the Representative Committee and the conditions, which were required for gathering a parliament belonged to the real representatives of the nation in Ankara, were almost completed.⁵⁶⁰

On March 19, 1920, three days after İstanbul had been occupied, Mustafa Kemal Pasha had already issued a communique regarding summoning of a new Parliament

⁵⁵⁸ Mango, *Ibid.*, p. 274.

⁵⁵⁹ *TV*, No.3826, 11 Nisan 1336 [11.04.1920], p. 1; *Tasfir-i Efkar*, No.3022, 11 Nisan 1336 [11.04.1920], p. 1; *Vakit*, No.871, 11 Nisan 1336 [11.04.1920], p. 1; *Yeni Gün*, No.379, 11 Nisan 1336 [11.04.1920], p. 1.

⁵⁶⁰ Kili, *Ibid.*, p. 60; Aybars, *İstiklal Mahkemeleri*, p. 10-11. The Sultan invited the whole nation to gather around the sultanate. The Sultan announced that the Assembly was annulled again and the elections would be held within four months. See *TV*, 3826, 11 Nisan 1336 [11.04.1920], p. 1; *Vakit*, No.871, 11 Nisan 1336 [11.04.1920], p. 1; *Yeni Gün*, No.379, 11 Nisan 1336 [11.04.1920], p. 1; *Alemdar*, No.479-2779, 11 Nisan 1336 [11.04.1920], p. 1; *Peyam-ı Sabah*, No.101, 11 Nisan 1336 [11.04.1920], p. 1.

in the name of President of the Representative Committee. *Açıksöz* published the communiqué with the title *Assembly with Extraordinary Powers in Ankara* (Ankara'da Salahiyet-i Fevkaladeyi Haiz Meclis) in its issue dated as March 21, 1920. According to news, Mustafa Kemal sent to all provinces, districts, and commanders of army corps, and informed that a new *Assembly with Extraordinary Powers* would be convened in Ankara; hence, he called for the people of Anatolia to hold the elections again, and asked the parliamentarians to reach Ankara in fifteen days. “This Parliament, which would be gathered by real representatives of the nation, would take and implement the measures to ensure the independence of the nation and the liberation of the state.”⁵⁶¹

While the general lections of the GNA continued to be held, *İrade-i Milliye* informed its readers that the Assembly would be copened on April 21, 1910, Wednesday: “The deputies elected in the various Provinces for Assembly with Extraordinary Powers in Ankara had set off. It is expected that the majority of deputies would arrive Ankara in ten days. Therefore, it had been decided that the Assembly would be convened on April 21, 1910, Wednesday.”⁵⁶² Although the newspaper estimated that the Assembly would be opened April 21, the elections could not be completed even April 23, 1920, when the Assembly would be summoned. Also, the most of the elected candiditates could not yet reach to Ankara, but there was no time to waste. In accordance with the report of *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, Mustafa Kemal Pasha issued a communique on April 21, 1920, calling for the covening of the GNA. He said that “on Friday, 23 April, after prayer, the Grand National Assembly, if God be willing, will be opened.” It instructed that all the honourable deputies would take part in this prayer, in the course of which the light of the Quran and the call to prayer would be poured forth over all the believers.⁵⁶³

⁵⁶¹ *Açıksöz*, No.39, 21 Mart 1336 [21.03.1920], pp. 2-3.

⁵⁶² *İrade-i Milliye*, No.37, 19 Nisan 1336 [19.04.1920], p. 1.

⁵⁶³ *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, No.24, 23 Nisan 1336 [23.04.1920], p. 3. Atatürk, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 294-295; Selek, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 350; Gökbilgin, *Ibid.*, p. 639; Kinross, *Ibid.*, p. 217. The first meeting had been considered on Thursday, April 22, during the negotiations with the incoming deputies in Ankara. However, according to Yunus Nadi and Kâzım Karabekir Pasha, it was deemed appropriate to postpone the opening to Friday, which was regarded blessed by the Muslims, in order to avoid any possible accusations of Shari'a factions. See Aysal, *Ibid.*, p. 197, Aydemir, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 241-242.

Deputies of the Ottoman Parliament had escaped from İstanbul and come to Ankara in different ways, and they had joined in the opening of the GNA. Under the intense national and religious atmosphere, the opening of the GNA was initiated by a solemn prayer in the Haji Bayram Mosque and the Assembly with Extraordinary Powers was opened on April 23, 1920, in Ankara with the participation of one hundred twenty parliamentarians. *İrade-i Milliye* announced the convention with the title “the Grand National Assembly Was Opened.” The newspaper elaborated the news as follow: “The GNA opened today after the Friday prayer with an excellent ceremony at 14:00. Following a prayer for the salvation of the nation and the Caliph, the eldest of the deputies, the deputy of Sinop Şerif Bey, came to the dais and delivered a short speech. In his speech, Şerif Bey expressed that this Assembly arose from the will of the nation in consequence of the occupation of İstanbul and the loosing the independence of the Caliphate and the center of Government. After mentioning the importance of national sovereignty, Şerif Bey said that with the title of the eldest president of this supreme council, and with the permission of the God, I open up the GNA by announcing to the whole world that the nation starts to take on and manage its own destiny within internal and external full independence. Later, Mustafa Kemal Pasha held the floor and delivered a speech.”⁵⁶⁴

On April 23, 1920, *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* announced the convention under the title of *A Historical Event: The Grand National Assembly*. The newspaper made following comments on the opening of the GNA:

Today, Ankara is witnessing a historical event: The deputies elected by the nation, who was exposed to the danger, and who was indecisive with its anxiety and determination to take its destiny to the shore of salvation, are all gathering here in the a large National Assembly. ... It is not a mistake to say that this event perhaps constitutes the biggest of all evidences, which will prove the ability of the nation to live, in our history, which is full of wonders.⁵⁶⁵

It can be seen that the newspaper evaluated the opening of the GNA as a great success of not only the Nationalists but also the Turkish nation itself. The continuing

⁵⁶⁴ *İrade-i Milliye*, No.39, 6 Mayıs 1336 [06.05.1920], p. 2. For further information, See Mahmut Goloğlu, *Üçüncü Meşrutiyet (1920): Birinci Büyük Millet Meclisi*, (İstanbul: TİBKY, 2008), p. 167; Durmuş Yalçın...[et al.]; *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Tarihi, Vol. I*, (Ankara: AAMY, 2004), pp. 190-191; Selek, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 350.

⁵⁶⁵ *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, No.24, 23 Nisan 1336 [23.04.1920], p. 1.

of the news, it was emphasized that the Turkish nation awakened again from its deep sleep with the convention of the GNA.

Apart from these papers, *Açıksöz* also announced the opening of the GNA with the title of *the Grand National Assembly* (Meclis-i Milli Kebir). The newspaper welcomed excitedly the convention of the GNA.⁵⁶⁶

With the inauguration of the GNA in Ankara on April 23, 1920, a new period was ushered in the history of the Turkish nation and foundation of a new state was laid in Ankara. The establishment of the new state was the result of the great achievement of the National Forces that rebelled against İstanbul, and showed great reaction to the occupying states by depending on will of the nation.⁵⁶⁷ Furthermore, the declaration of the GNA prepared the ground a totally national state, which would fight against the foreign powers and lead the revolution against the Ottoman rule. In this way, the authority gap left by the Ottoman Empire, which had been actively removed with the Mondros Armistice, was filled with power of the GNA.⁵⁶⁸ Moreover, the opening of the GNA was announced to European states on April 30, 1920.⁵⁶⁹

The newspapers in İstanbul could not publish any news about the development in Anatolian due to the pressure and censorship of the Ferid Pasha cabinet that did not want to be known what was happening in Anatolia. Hence, the İstanbul press could not give coverage to the proclamations of Mustafa Kemal, the elections for the news assembly, and opening of the GNA. During this period, the İstanbul press was engaged in the developments about the First Conference of London and San Remo Conference.

In the first days, the GNA took the following important decisions with the proposal of Mustafa Kemal, who was elected the President of the Assembly on the April 24,

⁵⁶⁶ *Açıksöz*, No.44, 25 Nisan 1336 [25.04.1920], p. 1.

⁵⁶⁷ Aysal, *Ibid.*, p. 163; Eroğlu, *Ibid.*, p. 204.

⁵⁶⁸ Ahmet Mumcu, *Tarih Açısından Türk Devriminin Temelleri ve Gelişimi*, (İstanbul: İnkılap Yayınevi, 1986), p. 52. About this issue, Yusuf Kemal (Tengirşek) Bey mentioned that "the new Turkish State was established on April 23, 1920. The Republican administration began to enact laws and to conclude agreements, and also to carry out these activities without requiring approval of any authority or person." Quoted from Eroğlu, *Ibid.*, p. 205.

⁵⁶⁹ Atatürk'ün Tamim, Telgraf ve Beyannameleri, pp. 328-329.

1920. *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* and *İrade-i Milliye* also published the text of proposal. The newspaper printed suggestions of Mustafa Kemal as follows:

It is absolutely necessary to form a Government. It is a vital principal to recognize that the national will expressed by the Assembly is actually administrating the destiny of the country. There is no power standing above the GNA of Turkey. The GNA of Turkey combines in itself the Legislative and the Executive Power. A Council elected and authorized by the Assembly conducts the affairs of the Government. The President of the Assembly is at the same time President of this Council. As soon as the Sultan-Caliph is freed from all pressure and coercion he will take his place within the frame of the legislative principles which will be determined by the Assembly.⁵⁷⁰

With the decision taken by the GNA dated on April 24, 1920, a new Executive Power; or Government would be formed in Ankara because the Assembly needed such a Cabinet so as to carry out the affairs. Moreover, the situation of the Sultan would have been determined by a law issued by the Assembly after the decisive victory was achieved, and İstanbul was rescued. In other words, Mustafa Kemal Pasha with this resolution clearly expressed that “the Sultan was put under the command of the GNA, and accordingly to the command of the Turkish nation, and he will adhere to the decisions of the Assembly.”⁵⁷¹ Mustafa Kemal Pasha expressed his ideas on this subject in his memoirs, Speech:

In reality, it was a question of acknowledging collapse and the abolition of the Ottoman rule and Caliphate. It meant the creation of a new State standing of new foundations. But to speak openly of the position as it revealed itself might eventually jeopardise the goal we were aiming at. For the general opinion inclined to the idea that the attitude of the Sultan-Caliph was excusable. Even in the Assembly during the first months there was a tendency to speak communion with the seat of the Caliphate, a union with the Central Government.⁵⁷²

No doubt, the policy of the new Turkish State would be different from the Ottoman Empire. In this respect, *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, media organ of the National Struggle, published a long speech of Mustafa Kemal Pasha, lasting for three sessions on April

⁵⁷⁰ *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, No.25, 28 Nisan 1336 [28.04.1920], pp. 2-3. *İrade-i Milliye*, No.39, 6 Mayıs 1336 [06.05.1920], pp. 2-3. For detail information, See Aysal, *Ibid.*, p. 164; Yalçın...[et al.]; *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 191; Goloğlu, *Üçüncü Meşrutiyet*, p. 172.

⁵⁷¹ When the situation of the Sultan and Caliph was mentioned at sessions of the Assembly from time to time, Mustafa Kemal Pasha skillfully siled over these subjects and stated that the Assembly was the highest authority in the country at every turn. As a matter of fact, when the period of armed struggle is over, the Assembly will adopt itself as the top power and Mustafa Kemal Pasha will carry out his revolution with this power. See Mumcu, *Ibid.*, p. 53.

⁵⁷² Atatürk, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 299.

24, 1920. He criticized the internal and external politics of the Ottoman Empire, and summarized the politics that the Grand National Assembly would follow:

The political system which we regard as clear and fully realizable is national policy. ...This is borne out in history and is the expression of science, reason and common sense. ...In order that our nation be able to live a happy, stable and permanent life, it is necessary that the State pursue an exclusively national policy and that this policy be in perfect agreement with our internal organization and be based on it...⁵⁷³

The Damat Ferid Pasha cabinet, remaining under the occupation of the enemy occupation in İstanbul, had almost no connection with the administration and problems of the country. That is, the Central Government was not based on the trust and the will of the nation, and it became the plaything of the occupying forces. For this reason, it was necessary to form an executive body based on the will of the nation and acting free from the pressure of enemy forces. In fact, the GNA was in need of establishing a cabinet to execute the tasks of the Assembly, representing the will of the nation. Mustafa Kemal Pasha, with a proposal, asked for the establishment of a government, by keeping his ideas concerning ‘‘Caliph and Sultanate’’ hidden.⁵⁷⁴ For this purpose, on April 25, 1920, the Council of Ministers was formed under the Chairmanship of Mustafa Kemal Pasha with the name of *Provisional Executive Committee*, consisting of seven members. The Cabinet of the GNA took over the administrative affairs of the country.⁵⁷⁵ The first act that the Provisional Government had made was to pass *the Law of National Treason* (Hıyanet-i Vataniye Kanunu) dated on April 29, 1920. The influential Anatolian newspapers, such as *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, *İrade-i Milliye*, and *Açıksöz*, the media organ of SDR of Katamonu, published the news of the Law of National Treason in their columns. For example, in accordance with the report of *Açıksöz*, this Act, consisted of fourteen articles, aimed at those who inclined to rebel against the legitimacy of the GNA and, even if their movements were verbal, they would be regarded as the traitors and

⁵⁷³ *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, No.25, 28 Nisan 1336 [28.04.1920], pp. 2-4. Also See Atatürk, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 299.

⁵⁷⁴ Goloğlu, *Üçüncü Meşrutiyet*, pp. 177-180; Aysal, *Ibid.*, p. 164.

⁵⁷⁵ Goloğlu, *Üçüncü Meşrutiyet*, p. 180; Kili, *Ibid.*, p. 93-94. Eroğlu, *Ibid.*, p. 204. The Provisional Executive Committee was consisted of Celaleddin Arif Bey, *Deputy of Erzurum*, Cemil Bey, *Deputy of Aydın*, Bekir Sami Bey, *Deputy of Tokat*, Colonel İsmet Pasha, *Deputy of Edirne*, Fevzi Pasha, *Deputy of İstanbul*, Hamdullah Suphi Bey, *Deputy of Antalya*, and Hakkı Behiç Bey, *Deputy of Kırşehir*. See Selek, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 353-354.

would be punished with death. Thus, the GNA accepted the legitimacy itself and proclaimed it to the whole public.⁵⁷⁶

The Provisional Government prepared the necessary legislation in a short time and submitted to the Parliament, on May 2, 1920 the “Law on the Ministers of the GNA” was adopted. In accordance with this law, the Government of the GNA would also have the General Staff as a ministry, the ministers would be elected from among the deputies in the Assembly, and the disputes among the ministers would be reconciled with by the Parliament. In this way, the first Government of the GNA,⁵⁷⁷ forming of eleven members, was established with the completion of the elections on May 3-4, 1920. *İrade-i Milliye* also gave coverage to the list of member of the Cabinet.⁵⁷⁸

It was also worthy to mention the Constitution of the GNA, namely *Teşkilat-ı Esasiye Kanunu*. Mustafa Kemal Pasha immediately initiated a series of constitutional preparations to strengthen the legal legitimacy of the GNA and the National Government. After the discussions, lasting nine months for constitutional draft, the Constitution, inspired from Populist program, was approved by the

⁵⁷⁶ Açıköz, No.45, 2 Mayıs 1336 [02.05.1920], p. 4; *Hâkimiyet-i Milliye*, No.26, 1 Mayıs 1336 [01.05.1920], p. 1; *İrade-i Milliye*, No.39, 6 Mayıs 1336 [06.05.1920], pp. 3-4. For detailed information, See Yalçın...[et al.]; *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 192; Mumcu, *Ibid.*, p. 54.

⁵⁷⁷ As a unique regime, this administrative system is called the “Parliamentary Government System”. As it was mentioned above, the GNA had an extraordinary character and it adopted the principle of “unity of power”. In other words, the Assembly gathered the all legislative, executive and judicial powers under its own roof. From that perspective, the GNA was responsible not only for enacting laws and decrees, but also for carrying out them. The ministers were carrying out the government affairs as “deputies” for the sake of the Assembly. These “deputies” could be always questioned severely, and they could be removed or replaced with new ones whenever the Assembly wanted. Moreover, with the help of the Parliamentary Government System, the ministers would save the time and they would avoid the conflicts between legislative and executive Powers. In fact, it was possible only in such a way that ministers would cope with big problems of the country. Ergun Özbudun, “Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi Hükümeti’nin Hukuki Niteliği”, *AAMD*, Vol. I, No. 2 (1985), pp. 483-487; Yalçın...[et al.]; *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 193.

⁵⁷⁸ Goloğlu, *Üçüncü Meşrutiyet*, p. 181; Yalçın...[et al.]; *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 193; Kili, *Ibid.*, p. 94. The list of the first Cabinet of the GNA was consisted of such members: President of the Assembly and Prime Minister: Mustafa Kemal Pasha; Minister of Interior: Cami Bey; Minister of Justice: Celaleddin Arif Bey; Minister of Public Works: İsmail Fazıl Pasha; Minister of Foreign Affairs: Bekir Sami Bey; Minister of Public Health and Welfare: Dr. Adnan Bey; Minister of Economy: Yusuf Kemal Bey; Minister of Finance: Hakkı Behiç Bey; Minister of Education: Dr. Rıza Nur Bey; Minister of National Defence: Fevzi Pasha; Chief of General Staff: İsmet Pasha; President of Religious Affairs: Mustafa Fehmi Efendi. See *İrade-i Milliye*, No.39, 6 Mayıs 1336 [06.05.1920], p. 3.

Assembly on January 20, 1921.⁵⁷⁹ The Constitution was the first act that described and defined the position, rights, and character of the Assembly, and the National Government. The first three fundamental provisions of the Constitution Act, consisting of twenty four articles, covered following articles: Firstly, sovereignty is vested in the nation without reservation and condition. The system of administration is based on the principle that the people guide their own destiny. Secondly, the executive and legislative powers are vested in the Grand National Assembly, the one and only representative body of the nation. Thirdly, the Turkish State is governed by the Grand National Assembly, and this government bears the name of Grand National Assembly of Turkey.⁵⁸⁰

As can be understood from the first three articles, the Constitution of 1921 was a constitutional document that declared that the sovereignty belongs to the nation rather than the constitutional monarchy and granted all the authorities to the GNA with respect to the exercise of sovereignty. With this constitution, the concept of the Sultan-State replaced with the Nation- State.⁵⁸¹ In addition, Mustafa Kemal Pasha issued a letter on January 30, 1921, and informed Grand Vizier Tefvik Pasha about the fundamental provisions of the Constitution of 1921.⁵⁸²

As a consequence, after the Allied occupation of İstanbul, the Ottoman Parliament was dissolved and the Central Government came under the rule of the Allied powers. Thus, there was a political gap in the country. The Nationalists made use of this turmoil and they filled the authority gap in the country with the opening of the GNA in Ankara. In this way, a new National State depended on the national will was established in Ankara. The new state did not recognize any authority above the power of the GNA. Meanwhile, the functionless of the Ottoman Parliament and the Allied occupation paved the way of legitimacy of the new Assembly; or the GNA in

⁵⁷⁹ Yalçın...[et al.]; Ibid., Vol. I, pp. 196-197.

⁵⁸⁰ For further information about the Constitution, See Suna Kili- Şeref Gözübüyük, *Sened-i İttifak'tan Günümüze Türk Anayasa Metinleri*, (İstanbul: TİBKY, 2006), pp. 105-108.

⁵⁸¹ Yalçın...[et al.]; Ibid., Vol. I, p. 197. The Seventh article of the Constitution is like that: "The power to execute decisions regarding religion and to enact, amend and repeal laws, and to ratify treaties and state of defence is vested in the Grand National Assembly. In making the laws and regulations the principle is to comply with the provisions concerning the religious and legal rights of the people as well as customary usage." It is clear that this article of the Constitution granted the sacred rights of the Sultan to the GNA. See Kili-Gözübüyük, Ibid., pp. 105-106.

⁵⁸² Atatürk, Ibid., Vol. II, pp. 382-383.

Ankara. The Nationalists, who assured their religious legitimacy of the National Struggle with the Fatwa of Rıfat Efendi, provided the legal legitimacy of the National movement by convening of the GNA and establishing Parliamentary Government. Ultimately, they consolidated the legal aspect of legitimacy of the national organization with the declaration of the first *Constitution* (Teşkilat-ı Esasiye Kanunu) of the National State. While the Anatolian press approved in favor of the national organization, the İstanbul press could not make any comment because of the censorship of the Damat Ferid Pasha and the Allies.

3.3.2. Conflicts Between Ankara and İstanbul and Revolts Against the Ankara Government

The spirit of National Independence, which had started to develop in Anatolia, increased its legal and political value with the opening of the GNA, which had national character and also based on the national sovereignty. The War of the National Independence had obtained a single center after a Government, formed within the Assembly, began to direct the future of the country and the nation. In order to ensure the confidence of the people, Mustafa Kemal issued a declaration in the name of the GNA on April 25, 1920. *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* gave coverage to the communiqué in the issue dated as April 28, 1920. In accordance with the report, the communiqué called “the nation for unity and solidarity and not to believe in enemy propagandas.” Also, it was especially emphasized in the declaration that “it was a great lie that the Nationalist had rebelled against the Caliph. The purpose of this unfounded claim was to defeat the forces, which defend the homeland, by means of the deceived Muslims and leave the country unattended.”⁵⁸³ The Nationalists did not want to be interpreted that the opening of the GNA was a reaction against the authority of the Sultan-Caliph. Therefore, they needed to elucidate that they did not revolt against the Sultan-Caliph; contrary to, they were loyal to the will of the Sultan and they just tried to achieve the independence of the country.

⁵⁸³ *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, No.25, 28 Nisan 1336 [28.04.1920], p. 1. For detailed information, See Atatürk'ün Tamim, Telgraf ve Beyannameleri, p. 317.

For Mustafa Kemal Pasha, the orders and fatwas of the İstanbul Government were no longer effective. The Turkish nation was determined to “defend its legitimate rights” and to conclude “honorable peace”. However, it was required that the situation had to be explained the Sultan. In this regard, *Açıksöz* published a telegraph sent to the Sultan by Mustafa Kemal Pasha on April 27, 1920. According to the telegraph in the newspaper, “it was reported that the GNA was established and the nation took up arms to defend the authority and prestige of the Sultanate, to defeat enemies of religion, to restore National Independence.” Moreover, Mustafa Kemal suggested the Sultan not to listen to the treacherous people who tried to show the National movement as a revolt against the Sultanate-Caliphate. He also added that “living in a way of poor and miserable under the administration of our Government is thousand times preferable to the tranquility and felicity, which would attain under the captivity of foreigner.”⁵⁸⁴ In this way, Mustafa Kemal Pasha tried to display loyalty of the Nationalists and the nation to the Sultan-Caliph.

However, the İstanbul Government under the head of Damat Ferid Pasha did not hesitate to resort to the most severe measures against the Nationalists by disregarding the interests of the country. Damat Ferid Pasha, who thought the Ankara Government had depended on no legitimate bases, tried to establish an army in order to destroy completely the National Forces. For this purpose, he also obtained the support of the British authorities.⁵⁸⁵ On April 18, 1920, Damat Ferid Pasha issued a proclamation announcing the establishment of an army called “Army of the Caliphate”; or “Kuvay-ı İnzibatiye” so as to suppress the movement of the National Forces. *Peyam-ı Sabah* published the proclamation of the Government on April 23, 1920. According to the newspaper, the purpose of Army of the Caliphate was explained as follows:

⁵⁸⁴ *Açıksöz*, No.45, 2 Mayıs 1336 [02.05.1920], p. 3. For the same telegraph See; *Hâkimiyet-i Milliye*, No.26, 1 Mayıs 1336 [01.05.1920], p. 1; *İrade-i Milliye*, No.39, 6 Mayıs 1336 [06.05.1920], p. 4.

⁵⁸⁵ Admiral De Robeck said in his report sent to the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Britain Lord Curzon that “Damat Ferid Pasha suggested to be strongly opposed to the national movement in Anatolia in order to suppress and that he asked how much the Entente Powers could help him. The High Commissioner replied that he would be allowed to use military forces against the Nationalists and that other benefits would come later. Also, that Entente Powers would fully support the Government to suppress the Nationalists.” See Şimşir, *İngiliz Belgelerinde Atatürk*, Vol. II, p. 29. Moreover, the British officers had allowed the Government to distribute weapons for the Army of the Caliphate from the Turkish arsenals under their control. See Sonyel, *İngiliz İstihbarat Servisi'nin Türkiye'deki Eylemleri*, p. 70.

The Caliphate Army was founded in order to overthrow the bandits, called as the National Forces that posed obstacles the officers of the Government to perform their duties and to carry out the state laws. The Army of the Caliphate is the armed force of the state. This organization will affiliate with the Ministries of War and Interior. The army will also help the law enforcement officers.⁵⁸⁶

It is understood that Ferid Pasha, who described the Nationalists as brigands, insisted not to recognize the National Forces as legitimate forces, emerging from the heart of the Turkish people. Also, he wanted to pit Turk against Turk.

For this vile attempt, in addition to the Britain, Damat Ferid Pasha also received financial support from various associations, such as the Association of the Friends of England, the Freedom and Accord Party, the Society of Military Nigahban (Askeri Nigahban Cemiyeti) and the Kızhançerliler.⁵⁸⁷

The Army of the Caliph, which the Government allocated approximately 1.250.836 Ottoman liras as total budget, was sent to İzmit April 29, 1920.⁵⁸⁸ Ahmet Anzavur, had been assigned as Commander of the Army of Caliphate, fought against the National Forces in the region. In fact, he had achieved some success against the Nationalists and he seized Adapazarı on May 10, Kandıra on May 13, and Doğançay on May 15, 1920. However, the forces of Çerkez Ethem defeated Anzavur and forced him to retreat.⁵⁸⁹

In addition to these attempts, Ferid Pasha established the First Customary and Martial Court in İstanbul on May 4, 1920. This Court decided to revoke “the official ranks and decorations of Mustafa Kemal Pasha and his colleagues, and they were sentenced with death penalty by the Court.”⁵⁹⁰

⁵⁸⁶ *Peyam-ı Sabah*, No.113, 23 Nisan 1336 [23.04.1920], p. 1; *Alemdar*, No.490-2790, 23 Nisan 1336 [23.04.1920], p. 1; *TV*, No.3835, 18 Nisan 1336 [18.04.1920], p. 1.

⁵⁸⁷ Günay Çağlar, “Kuvay-ı İnzibatiye”, *Ankara Üniversitesi TİTE-AYD*, No. 4 (1995), p. 344.

⁵⁸⁸ *Alemdar*, No. 497-2797, 29 Nisan 1336 [29.04.1920], p. 1; *Peyam-ı Sabah*, No.119, 29 Nisan 1336 [29.04.1920], p. 1.

⁵⁸⁹ After Ahmet Anzavur had retreated, Süleyman Şefik Pasha was assigned as the Commander of the Army of Caliphate and the units of the Army of the Caliphate again started to move against the National Forces from İzmit on June 14, 1920. Ali Fuat Pasha, who had been equipped for a while in Sapanca, destroyed the Army with a counter attack. On this failure of the Army of the Caliphate, troops were sent back to İstanbul on June 20, 1920. Ministry of War decided to abolish the Army of the Caliphate on June 25, 1920. Çağlar, “Kuvay-ı İnzibatiye”, pp. 353-354; *TV*, No.3905, 25 Haziran 1336 [25.06.1920], p. 1.

⁵⁹⁰ *Atatürk İle İlgili Arşiv Belgeleri*, p. 82.

In return for this attempt of İstanbul, the Ankara Government issued a communiqué published in *İrade-i Milliye* on May 6, 1920. In the news, it was reported that the Government decided to cut off all kinds of official communication with İstanbul. The Government also instructed to send all kinds of official documents and newspapers back to İstanbul. Also, the Government strictly cautioned that officers who accepted or did not send such documents would be counted as traitors.⁵⁹¹ In addition to this action, a second decision taken on May 24, 1920, and the GNA determined to be ignored “all kinds of promotions and other actions of the illegitimate İstanbul Government.”⁵⁹² It is seen that the GNA clearly considered itself as a different and separate authority apart from the İstanbul Government. The Ankara Government, which described the attempt of İstanbul as treason for the country, expressed not to recognize the Damat Ferid Pasha cabinet. Additionally, according to the proposals suggested by Dr. Adnan (Adivar) and adopted by the Assembly in the session of June 7, 1920, all agreements and conventions that the Government had signed after March 16, 1920, and all the decisions it made, and all concessions given directly or indirectly to foreigners were declared null and void.⁵⁹³

As it can be seen that the tension between İstanbul and Ankara was extremely high and a relentless struggle took place during that time. Also, the İstanbul Government continued to exploit the religious sensitivities of the people with fatwas and kinds of religious communiques. Ferid Pasha cabinet encouraged the people to revolt against the National Forces. For this purpose, he again took support of the British authorities. Ultimately, many rebellions emerged in many regions of Anatolia as the results of the influence of the fatwas and communiqué and the negative propagandas of the Government and Britain.⁵⁹⁴ Apart from these, the rebellions, which aimed at destroying the authority of the GNA and dispersing the national organization, generally stemmed from following reasons: First of all, long years of war and defeats led to arise frustration, tiredness and poverty in Turkish society; as a result of this, the number of deserters from the National Forces increased. The reactionary trends, which stemmed from the religious and traditional ties to the Sultan-Caliph, triggered

⁵⁹¹ *İrade-i Milliye*, No.40, 13 Mayıs 1336 [13.05.1920], p. 1

⁵⁹² Goloğlu, *Üçüncü Meşrutiyet*, p. 183; *Atatürk İle İlgili Arşiv Belgeleri*, p. 84.

⁵⁹³ Goloğlu, *Üçüncü Meşrutiyet*, pp. 187-188.

⁵⁹⁴ Akandere-Polat, *Ibid.*, pp. 141-142.

anti-Nationalists activities. Moreover, the Freedom and Accord Party claimed that the supporters of the National Struggle were *unionist* and that they would bring *Bolshevism* and this propanada created fear among the people. Also, the İstanbul Government wanted to collapse the authority of the Ankara Government. Apart from this, the Britain, who tried to dominate the Straits, wanted to create uproar around Biga, Gönen and Bolu in order to prevent the threats from the East. In addition, some commanders of the National Forces resisted to be taken under the control of regular army. Also, some of the Rums and Armenians, who rebelled with the encouragement of England, France, Italy, Greece and US missionaries in Anatolia, tried to undermine the National Struggle.⁵⁹⁵

These rebellions, which the İstanbul Government and the British took advantage of the tiredness of the Turkish nation emerged through the years of long wars, can be categorized as follows: The First Bozkır Revolt (September 2-October 4, 1919); The First Anzavur Revolt (October 1-November 30, 1919); The Second Bozkır Revolt (October 20-November 4, 1919); Şeyh Eşref Revolt (October 26-December 24, 1919); The Second Anzavur Revolt (February 16-April 16, 1920); Bolu and Düzce Revolts (April 13-May 31, 1920); Yozgat Revolts (May 15-August 27, 1920); Konya Revolts (October 2-October 22, 1920); Milli Aşireti Revolt (June-September 1920); Koçgiri Revolt (March 6- June 18, 1921).⁵⁹⁶

These rebellions became more and more dangerous every day and eventually reached around Ankara. Mustafa Kemal Pasha interpreted the situation with the following expressions in “Speech” (Nutuk):

The territories involved were Bandırma, Gönen, Ssusurluk, Kirmasti, Karacabey, Biga, İzmit, Adapazarı, Düzce, Hnedek, Bolu, Grede, Nallihan, Beypazarı, Bozkır, Konya, Iğın, Kadınhan, Çivril, Seydişehir, Beyşehir, Koçhisar, Yozgat, Yenihan, Boğazlıyan, Şile, Erbaa, Çorum, Ümraniye, Refahiye, Zara, Hafik and Viranşehir. In all these the flaming fire of rebellion raged and reduced the whole country to ashes. The clouds of treachery, of ignorance, of hatred and fanaticism darkened the sky and threw the whole of the country into deep shadow. The waves of insurrection surged even up to the walls of our headquarters at Ankara. We

⁵⁹⁵ Kemal Çelik, “Milli Mücadele’de İç İsyanlar, Vatana İhanet Kanunu ve İstiklâl Mahkemeleri”, *Ankara Üniversitesi TİTE-AYD*, No. 40 (2007), pp. 584-585.

⁵⁹⁶ Çelik, *Ibid.*, pp. 586-589; Aybars, *İstiklal Mahkemeleri*, pp. 14-16.

encountered audacious attacks, which culminated in the destruction of the telegraphic communication between our headquarters and the town.⁵⁹⁷

These insurrections had to be suppressed in order to provide internal security and authority. On the other hand, the GNA had no enough force. The Ankara Government could not suppress the internal rebellion since it sent forces to the front to prevent foreign attacks. If the GNA sent troops to the insurrection region to remove the internal rebellion, they could not resist the external attacks. The uprisings were suppressed, especially by the commander of Kuvay-ı Seyyare Çerkez Ethem. In addition, the forces of the National Forces had also used for the suppression. Moreover, the Courts of Independence (İstiklal Mahkemeleri) were established in order to try cases of treason.⁵⁹⁸ However, Çerkez Ethem himself revolted against the Ankara Government because he did not accepted to join the regular army, which would be established.⁵⁹⁹

Some of these rebellions, which had emerged in different histories and places, often reaching dangerous dimensions for the National Struggle, and often suppressed in difficult times, had been conducted directly by the İstanbul Government. In addition to these, the occupying states spent their efforts to crush the national awakening in the regions, which had been left to their own influence and mobilized the people by means of exploitation of religion with the help of agents cooperating with the İstanbul Government. These rebellions, which erupted in a time when the Turkish nation put up a fight for independence, weakened the power of the National Forces and caused to loose time, opportunity and people of the Nationalists. The Ankara Government had suffered tremendous financial and moral losses.⁶⁰⁰ Tevfik Bıyıklıoğlu elaborated the issue with the following expressions:

The loss of life and property in the internal rebellions were not subordinate to the losses that the Greeks caused in the early days. These destructive uprisings behind the front covered the whole of Central Anatolia. The new parliament and the newly formed Government had collapsed nearly under these bloody struggles. The

⁵⁹⁷ Atatürk, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 303.

⁵⁹⁸ Aybars, *İstiklal Mahkemeleri*, p. 18; Goloğlu, *Üçüncü Meşrutiyet*, pp. 211-213; Bıyıklıoğlu, *Ibid.*, p. 133.

⁵⁹⁹ Çerkez Ethem and his brothers, who serving for the purpose of Ankara until 1921, clearly rebelled against the administration of Ankara and joined the Greeks. See Paul Gentizon, *Mustafa Kemal ve Uyanan Doğu*, trans. By Fethi Ülkü, (Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1983), p. 22.

⁶⁰⁰ Yalçın...[et al.]; *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 197; Aysal, *Ibid.*, 167.

President of the Assembly, Mustafa Kemal Pasha's calmness and courage saved the situation.⁶⁰¹

The İstanbul and Anatolian press provided information about the revolst in Anatolia. But the press mostly focused on Ahmet Anzavur Revolt,⁶⁰² which posed a great challenge and loosing for the Nationalists by revolting against the National Forces two times. One of his revolts had started on October 1, 1919, and the other one had emerged on February 16, 1920. *İzmir'e Doğru* published a report concerning to the first rebellion of Ahmet Anzavur and narrated him and the situation as follows:

Ahmet Anzavur, who performed the duties such as District Governor of İzmit and Balıkesir and commandership of battalion and troop in the regions of Bursa, Çanakkale and Balıkesir, and also formed the forces of infantry, cavalry and artillery under his command owing to the help of the British, began his activities to create his own authority in the region and to scatter the national formations by gathering the bandits such as Şah İsmail, Cambazlar Hakkı, Elkesenin Nuri, Kadir ve Sülüklülü Davut around himself.⁶⁰³

The news claimed that Ahmet Anzavur was very successful against the Nationalists and he took the region under his control. They were achievements of Anzavur at the very beginning of his revolt. Also, the news contuniued that Ahmet Anzavur, who introduced the Nationalists as the Bolshevik movement, asserted that Mustafa Kemal robbed the people and that he tried to maintain the unionism.

According to another news of *İzmir'e Doğru*, Ahmet Anzavur had made the great effort to get support of the Cherkess as well as the support of the Sultan-Caliph. He walked around the Circassian villages and said "I hold the order of then Sultan in my hand; the Sultan orders this. I will dissolve the National Forces; they will already kill Circassians and cut their children." In this way, he collected two hundred-people force. Anzavur did various kinds of evil with his forces in Susurluk and Gönen.⁶⁰⁴

Ahmet Anzavur, who founded a society called *Cemiyet-i Ahmediye*, revolted for the second time on February 16, 1920, with the support of Damat Ferid and the English.

⁶⁰¹ Bıyıklıoğlu, *Ibid.*, p. 133.

⁶⁰² Kinross described Ahmet Anzavur like that: "Typical leaders of Army of the Caliph was an aged and illiterate Circassian bandit named Anzavur, operating in the region north of Symrna. A fanatical Muslim, who fought under the flag of the Prophet with a Quran round his neck and hanged his enemies, likewise Muslims, on fig trees, he enjoyed the active favour of the İstanbul Government." See Kinross, *Ibid.*, p. 227.

⁶⁰³ *İzmir'e Doğru*, No.2, 20 Teşrin-i Sani 1335 [20.11.1919], p. 1.

⁶⁰⁴ *İzmir'e Doğru*, No.4, 30 Teşrin-i Sani 1335 [30.11.1919], p. 1.

İzmir'e Doğru published some news concerning the reaction to this society and the rebellion. Mayor of Söke Rifat and Müftü of Söke Ömer Lütfü said about aforementioned society:

We have been informed with complete sadness that a dallier called Ahmed had established a society under the name of Ahmediye and he instigated some evil incitement against the integrity and independence of our country and the harmony and solidarity of our nation in a critical time that destiny of our nation and country is re-established.⁶⁰⁵

The newspaper thought that the activities of Anzavur and his society would damage the country and would affect the Allies, who were working to determine the destiny country in London Conference.

When Ahmet Anzavur was assaigned by the İstanbul Government as the Governor of Balıkesir with the title of ‘‘Pasha’’, the press, especially anti-nationalist newspapers, welcomed him kindly. In the news published in *Alemdar*, Ahmet Anzavur was praised as follows: ‘‘As a squadron leader, he (Ahmet Anzavur), who cleaned up Biga-Gönen and the surrounding from non-national brigands, will also show his heroisms now that he had already proved his heroisms until now.’’⁶⁰⁶

As in the first revolt, Ahmet Anzavur again strived to attract the people to his side by exploiting religious feelings of the people. For example, *Alemdar* claimed that ‘‘Ahmet Anzavur is fighting against the Nationalists for the sake of religion and based on the Qur'an, and that his friends and him do jihad on the behalf of the God.’’⁶⁰⁷

Another news in the *Alemdar* displated the rebellion of Ahmet Anzavur as a legitimate action. According to the report, Anzavur had called his forces *Kuvay-ı Muhammediye* and claimed that his purpose was to preserve the Caliphate. Additionally, ‘‘Anzavur said that he moved in the name of the Caliph everywhere he

⁶⁰⁵ *İzmir'e Doğru*, No.41, 17 Mart 1336 [17.03.1920], p. 1. ‘‘Mukadderat-ı milliye ve mülkiyemizin hal edilmekte olduğu böyle bir sırada Ahmet isminde bir serserinin kendi ismine izafetle Ahmediye namına bir cemiyet teşkiline yeltenerek vatanımızın tamamıyet ve istiklali ve milletimizin ahenk ve tesanütü aleyhinde birtakım tahrikât-ı melanetkaranede bulunmakta olduğu kemal-i teessüfle haber aldık.’’

⁶⁰⁶ *Alemdar*, April 7, 1920, p. 1. ‘‘Biga-Gönen ve çevresini gayri milli çetelerden temizleyen binbaşı olarak şimdide kadar gösterdiği kahramanlıkları şimdi de gösterecektir.’’

⁶⁰⁷ *Alemdar*, No.478-2778, 10 Nisan 1336 [10.04.1920], p. 1.

went, and explained that the National Forces was a movement inclining towards partition of the country. They were enemies of the state and the Sultan.’⁶⁰⁸

An interesting published in *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* attributed the Anzavur rebellion to the eastern policies of Britain, such as the occupation of İstanbul and the coming of Damat Ferid Pasha into power. “The editorial interpreted ‘the change of Government in İstanbul’ as follows: The English wanted to bring a government that would accepted their own ideas in order to create a chaotic atmosphere in Anatolia after separating İstanbul from Anatolia. The Cabinet was trying to fulfill this mission by sending Anzavur to Anatolia. Also, it was also regarded as a requirement of the British policy to have Muslims killed by Christians everywhere. The English, who practiced these intrigues, will say at the end to the people of Anatolia that you have no Caliph, weapons, no money, and your wise men are captive, you will be subject to us. We will operate the mine, oil and wealth of your country. The newspaper also claimed that Britain would call to the Indian Muslims and say, the Caliph is our hand, the Turks, in the case of independence, have fallen out with each other. Your uprising for them is unavailing. For Islam, independence is over and Islam is under the command of England. To the article, it is precisely the British policy of Islam.’⁶⁰⁹

As far as understood from the news, the British authorities wanted to show Muslims who desired a resistance like Turks and to revolt for their own independence that Turks kill each other and do not expect help form them. English tried to convince Muslims inclining to revolt that there is no hope for freedom of Islam-Muslims and they took everything under their control.

⁶⁰⁸ *Alemdar*, No.522-2822, 25 Mayıs 1336 [25.05.1920], p. 1.

⁶⁰⁹ *Hâkimiyet-i Milliye*, No.23, 20 Nisan 1336 [20.04.1920], p. 1. For the similar news, See *Öğüt*, No.336, 14 Nisan 1336 [14.04.1920], p. 1. The English were worried about the fact that the possibility of the occupation movement carried out by the Greeks would produce nothing and the unification of Anatolian and the Thracian Nationalists. They had supported the revolt of Ahmet Anzavur in order to get rid of this uneasiness. According to the Britain, the rebellion of Ahmet Anzavur would create a “buffer zone” between the National Forces and the areas close to the Straits of İstanbul and Çanakkale, and this region would be the zone of influence of Sultan Vahdeddin. Thus, the control over the Straits would be easily ensured. Priest Dr. Robert Frew, who was in the member of Intelligence Service in İstanbul, would assist Anzavur with money and weapons. Özcan Mert, “Anzavur’un İlk Ayaklanmasına Ait Belgeler”, *Belleten*, Vol. LVI, No. 217 (1992), pp. 858-861.

3.3.3. Intimacy of Ankara and İstanbul Governments: Bilecik Meeting

“The armed violence policy” of Damat Ferid Pasha, who did not avoid cooperating with the enemy in any way and applied to all the methods so as to suppress the National movement, failed since the National Government in Ankara had a strong authority relied on the nation itself. Indeed, the Ankara Government, which had been challenged fearlessly with the internal riots and the Greek attacks, overcame all one-by-one, and proved its power and stability in the country.

The gradual strengthening authority of the Ankara Government made the Allied powers worried about the aftermath of the Sevres Treaty signed by the İstanbul Government on August 10, 1920, but not recognized by Ankara. Therefore, they decided to create intimacy between İstanbul and Ankara by sending a deputation to Ankara. On this point, the influence of the French and Italian governments played crucial role in the adoption of this decision and eventually, they could achieve to persuade Britain with the help of Ambassador Fleuriau on August 20, 1920. It was evident that particularly the French thought that the challenges with the GNA should be solved in peaceful ways, instead of armed struggle. As a result, Therefore, Allied Powers decided on September 24, 1920, that a deputation should be sent to Anatolia. In this way, they sought peaceful solutions without resorting to much more violence.⁶¹⁰

The Allies needed a reconciliatory cabinet, thus, they forced Ferid Pasha to offer his resignation. Then, he withdrew from the power on October 17, 1920, on the grounds

⁶¹⁰ Actually, Lord Curzon, the British Minister of Foreign Affairs, acknowledged to be sent a deputation to Ankara, but firstly he wanted to be approved the Treaty of Sevres before the deputation sett off to Ankara. He believed that the provisional ratification of the Sevres Treaty would calm down the Ankara Government, and this would strengthen the hands of the Allies. Moreover, Lord Hardinge, the British Undersecretary of Foreign Affairs, claimed that sending a deputation would be a dangerous strategy before the ratification of the Sevres because this would give a chance to Mustafa Kemal to bargain with them. In addition, he thought that if Mustafa Kemal suggested some modifications for the Sevres Treaty to ratify, his conditions would not be accepted. However, Admiral De Robeck, the British High Commissioner, asked his Government, in his report dated September 10, 1920, to establish relations with Ankara in order to include the Ankara in the treaty. Oğuz AYTEPE, “Milli Mücadele’de Bilecik Görüşmesi” *Ankara Üniversitesi TİTE-AYD*, No: 33-34, 2004, pp. 24-25.

of his health problems.⁶¹¹ On the other hand, the reason for resignation of Ferid Pasha was interpreted differently in the press. For instance, anti-nationalist newspaper, *Peyam-ı Sabah* wrote that Damat Ferid Pasha finally withdrew. It was already obvious that the continuing depression for a while would lead to such a conclusion; or the resignation of Damat Ferid Pasha. In this way, the newspaper noticed that the resignation of Ferid Pasha because of health problems did not reflect the truth.⁶¹²

In the editorial of a nationalist journal, *Vakit* dated as October 23, 1920, it was expressed that “the Damat Ferid Pasha cabinet applied all kinds of tools to have influence on Anatolia during the last six months of his administration, but in order to achieve this purpose; he faded away like a candle burning itself.” In this way, the article confessed that Ferid Pasha had resigned because of his failure in suppression of the National movement. Also, the newspaper added that none would know whether the new government would succeed in the face of the same problems, or not.⁶¹³ It was evident that Damat Ferid Pasha withdrew from the power due to not getting positive results of his violence policy against the Nationalists.

The nationalist journal printed in Ankara, *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* published news about the withdrawal of Ferid Pasha. The newspaper directed severe criticism on Ferid Pasha and his activities. The journal argued that Ferid Pasha had always damaged the country for two years.

Damat Ferid, who had caused trouble to the destiny of the Turkish nation for two years with an absolute belief and political confidence that he received from the Sultan, has been overthrown among the voices of hatred and disgust from all sides. Under a blind ambition, this man is a miserable, who turned the biggest traitor to the nation, as an instrument of the ungrateful ambition of the internal and the external. He had caused the people of this homeland to slaughter each other, to ruin thousands of families, to waste of millions of Turkish wealth, and to destroy the nation.⁶¹⁴

Another nationalist journal published in Anatolia, *Anadolu'da Yeni Gün* interpreted that “fall of Ferid Pasha cabinet resulted from changing of opinion of Britain. That

⁶¹¹ Jaeschke, *İngiliz Belgeleri*, p. 157.

⁶¹² *Peyam-ı Sabah*, No.292, 19 Teşrin-i Evvel 1336 [19. 10.1920], p. 1.

⁶¹³ *Vakit*, No.1032, 23 Ekim 1336 [23.10.1920], p. 1.

⁶¹⁴ *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, No.68, 25 Teşrin-i Evvel 1336 [25.10.1920], p. 1. For the similar news, See *Açıksöz*, No.89, 25 Teşrin-i Evvel 1336 [25.10.1920], p. 1.

is, the British authorities had to find a way for agreement with Anatolia since they understood that the Sevres Treaty would not be implemented by force.” Accordingly, *Anadolu’da Yeni Gün* followed the government reshuffle in İstanbul as an ordinary event.⁶¹⁵ According to the issue of *Anadolu’da Yeni Gün* dated as October 24, 1920, “the government reshuffle in İstanbul proved that the Anatolian case was truth, legitimate, powerful, and influential. The fall of Damat Ferid was the victory of Anatolia. However, all victories were insignificant until the main victory; or, the independence and integrity of the nation was recognized. Moreover, the government reshuffle occurred because it had been noticed that Damat Ferid would not reach an agreement with Anatolia.”⁶¹⁶

The new Cabinet was formed under the head of Tevfik Pasha on October 21, 1920. The anti-nationalist journal, *Alemdar* claimed that the main duty of the new government was to reconciliation with Ankara in terms of conditions of peace treaty. *Alemdar* wrote about this issue that “the Government of Tevfik Pasha was in power to ensure the implementation of the Treaty of Sevres and to provide peace and tranquility by establishing political ties with Anatolia.”⁶¹⁷ *Anadolu’da Yeni Gün* also interpreted “the Tevfik Pasha cabinet had been established so as to compromise with Anatolia. Moreover, the newspaper did not suspect that the Tevfik Pasha cabinet had been consisted of honorable people. However, the journal argued that the members of new cabinet were very slow moving people and they believed that the best politics in the world was to have a good time and enjoy. Additionally, the paper said that these people were narrow-minded that had not done anything rather than signing document for many years.”⁶¹⁸ As it is clear from the statements, the journal was not hopeful about the Tevfik Pasha cabinet.

Undoubtedly, the Allied powers were personally involved in assigning of Tevfik Pasha as Grand Vizier in order to break the ice between İstanbul and Ankara. In fact, they set to work to create a ground of agreement with the Ankara Government so as

⁶¹⁵ *Anadolu’da Yeni Gün*, No.442-62, 22 Teşrin-i Evvel 1336 [22.10.1920], p. 1.

⁶¹⁶ *Anadolu’da Yeni Gün*, No.444-64, 24 Teşrin-i Evvel 1336 [24.10.1920], p. 1.

⁶¹⁷ *Alemdar*, No.667-9667, 25 Ekim 1336 [25.10.1290], p. 1; *TV*, No.3988, 21 Ekim 1336 [21.10.1290], p. 1. For the whole proclamation of Tevfik Pasha, See Güner-Kabataş, *Ibid.*, pp. 205-207.

⁶¹⁸ *Anadolu’da Yeni Gün*, No.450-70, 3 Teşrin-i Sani 1336 [03.11.1920], p. 1.

to assure the ratification of stillborn-Treaty of Sevres by Ankara.⁶¹⁹ The Allies even gave importance to bringing pro-Nationalists to the active position in the Tevfik Pasha cabinet. Therefore, the former Grand Viziers, Ahmet İzzet Pasha, was brought to the Ministry of Interior and Salih Pasha was brought to the Ministry of Maritime Affairs. These two ministers were recognized for their closeness to the National Forces.⁶²⁰

On October 23, 1920, Tevfik Pasha cabinet decided to send a deputation, consisted of ministers, to Anatolia with the aim of learning the considerations of the Ankara Government about the Sevres Treaty.⁶²¹ Ahmet İzzet Pasha came into contact with the Nationalists and requested Mustafa Kemal Pasha to have a negotiation. Mustafa Kemal Pasha did not reject the offer of negotiation and sent a letter to İzzet Pasha informing that meeting would be held on December 5, 1920, at the train station in Bilecik. He also elucidated the direction the deputy of İstanbul would follow: “You could travel by rail from İstanbul to Sapanca and continue your journey by motor-car; or, you could come by sea to Bursa and go from there to Bilecik.” In addition, he demanded that Salih Pasha should have involved in the deputation of İstanbul. İzzet Pasha and his friends chose the route of İzmit-Geyve.⁶²²

Ahmet İzzet Pasha started to choose members of deputation after he received a positive reply from Ankara for the negotiations. In the meantime, the meeting in Bilecik was closely followed by the press and had a wide coverage since the

⁶¹⁹ Taner Bilgin, “Milli Mücadele Döneminde Bilecik”, (U.D.D.), (Sakarya: Sakarya Üniversitesi, 2012), p. 172. As will be elaborated in detail, while the Ankara Government was trying to suppress of internal rebellions, the Supreme Council in San Remo engaged in preparing the Treaty of Sevres, which determined the destiny of Anatolia. On 18-26 April 1920, the Supreme Council prepared the outline of the Sevres and sent a copy to the İstanbul Government to sign it. On August 10, 1920, Sevres Treaty was signed by the İstanbul Government. However, it was not approved because the Ottoman Parliament had been abolished on April 11, 1920. In addition, the National Parliament in Ankara promptly rejected the treaty, and even the Sultan did not sign. Hence, the Treaty of Sevres remained unratified. Now, the Allies began to pursue the policy of reconciliation between İstanbul and Ankara for the approval of the Sevres by the GNA. On the one hand, it was hard to negotiate with Ankara for Allies; on the other hand, it gradually forced them to accept “the reality of the Government of the GNA.” See Jaeschke, *İngiliz Belgeleri*, pp. 156-157; Criss, *Ibid.*, p. 18.

⁶²⁰ Osman Özsoy, *Saltanattan Cumhuriyete Kurtuluş Savaşı; Olaylar – Belgeler - Gerçekler*, (İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları, 2007), pp. 292-293.

⁶²¹ Özsoy, *Ibid.*, p. 293. All the topics discussed in the first five meetings of the Cabinet were included in the report of the British Intelligence Service sent to London on November 10, 1920. See Sonyel, *İngiliz İstihbarat Servisi'nin Türkiye'deki Eylemleri*, pp. 127-128.

⁶²² Atatürk, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 346; Ahmet İzzet Pasha, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 96; Bilgin, *Ibid.*, pp. 172-173.

beginning. *Vakit* informed that “the deputation was consisted of six members such as, Salih Pasha, Minister of Navy, Hüseyin Kazım, Minister of Trade and Agriculture, Cevat, Ambassador of Bern, Münir Bey, Legal Advisor of Sublime Port, and Fatin Efendi, Director of the Observatory, under the presidency of His Excellency İzzet Pasha, Minister of Interior. The delegation will move today to Ankara by train at the Haydarpaşa Train Station. Also, the newspaper wrote that the delegation would go to Anatolia in order to reach an agreement with the National Forces.”⁶²³ The delegation could arrive Bilecik on December 4, 1920, after a painful journey and settled in the apartment that had been reserved for them. Meanwhile, Mustafa Kemal Pasha had come to Bilecik on December 5, 1920. He was accompanied by İsmet Pasha, *Commander of the Western Front*, Bekir Sami Bey, *Minister of Foreign Affairs*, Mahmut Esat (Bozkurt) Bey, *Minister of Economy*, Muhittin Baha (Pars) Bey, *Deputy of Bursa*, Hakkı Behiç, Kılıç Ali, Celal (Bayar) Bey, some other deputies and military assistants.⁶²⁴ *Anadolu'da Yeni Gün*, which had started to be published since August of 1920 in Ankara, narrated the developments in Bilecik as follows: “Members of the İstanbul deputation were welcomed and hosted in the room of Mustafa Kemal Pasha at the train station in Bilecik and they ate lunch there. They first made a brief city tour after eating. After then, delegation visited Fevzi Pasha, Minister of the National Defense. Later, they settled in the houses reserved to them.”⁶²⁵

Some nationalist newspapers in İstanbul shared different comments on the Bilecik meeting. For instance, *İkdam* wrote that “the removing of the duality between Anatolia and the Center is the desire of everyone, especially the Sultan. However, it is not in the hands of the (İstanbul) Government to accept the demands of Anatolia. Confirming or rejecting them was under the authority of the Great Powers.”⁶²⁶ As it is seen clearly stated that İstanbul expected to reach an agreement with Ankara, but it also admitted that the İstanbul Government could not act freely and had no authority

⁶²³ *Vakit*, No.1071, 3 Kanun-i Evvel 1336 [03.12.1920], p. 1.

⁶²⁴ Ahmet İzzet Pasha, *Ibid.*, p. 97; Bilgin, *Ibid.*, pp. 175-176; Aytepe, *Ibid.*, pp. 28-29. “Mustafa Kemal Pasha had come to Bilecik on December 3, 1920, and had waited us. However, he noticed that we had been delayed, he had gone to Eskişehir. He came again to Bilecik afternoon on December 5, 1920.” See Ahmet İzzet Pasha, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 97.

⁶²⁵ *Anadolu'da Yeni Gün*, No.472-92, 7 Kanun-i Evvel 1336 [07.12.1920], p. 1.

⁶²⁶ *İkdam*, No.8528, 5 Kanun-i Evvel 1336 [05.12.1920], p. 1.

or influence fate of the country. That is, the Government lost its administrative function on the people. These statements are significant in terms of showing that the real authority on the Turkish people was the Ankara Government.

News of *İkdam* quoted from Bosphore, a British weekly published in İstanbul, reported that the Allied powers wondered the possible results of the Bilecik meeting. The article said that “the Allies will want to wait for the outcomes of the negotiations between İstanbul and Anatolia before they determine their new political move. For this reason, the attitude of the Allied powers may change in accordance with whether Anatolia agrees with İstanbul, or not.”⁶²⁷

Apart from *İkdam*, *Akşam* also shared news referring to the expectations of the Allied Powers with the Bilecik meeting. The journal wrote about:

The most important statement of Mr. Lloyd George in the House of Commons: We all desire the consolidation of peace and tranquility in Anatolia. That is why we should negotiate with the Turks within reason and logic. But it is not possible for us to negotiate with the rebel Mustafa Kemal before he agreed with Sublime Port.⁶²⁸

According to these statements, the Allied powers did not recognize Mustafa Kemal as legitimate representative of the Turkish people. They wanted to ensure his obedience to the authority of the İstanbul Government. They actually thought that peace and order would be actualized in Anatolia on condition that Anatolia adhered to İstanbul.

In addition to nationalist journal in İstanbul, nationalist Anatolian press also dwelled on the Bilecik meeting. *Anadolu'da Yeni Gün* in Ankara made valuable comments on the meeting. The newspaper did not suspect that the Tevfik Pasha cabinet had been consisted of honorable people. On other hand, the journal thought that there was no an issue to compromise between İstanbul and Anatolia. “It would be possible to reach an agreement with İstanbul if the Treaty of Sevres had not been signed. However, the agreement had been dependent on a condiditon of ratification of the Sevres Treaty, which meant the annihilation of Turkish nation. The İstanbul Government had accepted the Peace of Sevres.” So then, it was betrayer. The

⁶²⁷ *İkdam*, No.8532, 9 Kanun-i Evvel 1336 [09. 12. 1920], p. 1. From *Bosphore*.

⁶²⁸ *Akşam*, No.812, 26 Kanun-i Evvel 1336 [26. 12. 1920], p. 1.

Government was such a traitor that it had betrayed both Anatolia and itself because the Government actually destroyed itself as well. Therefore, “İstanbul could not be interlocutor of Anatolia. The fact that not interfering of Anatolia would be the greatest favor of İstanbul for it.”⁶²⁹ According to the newspaper, the İstanbul Government was not innocent and legitimate authority since it signed the Sevres Treaty. Thus, it was out of the question to compromise with betrayer İstanbul. In fact, the journal admitted in advance that the meeting in Bilecik did not produce any positive result.

When the two deputations met in a room at the railway station of Bilecik, Mustafa Kemal was the first to speak. After he had introduced himself as “President of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey and its Government,” he asked: “with who have I the honour of speaking?” Then, Salih Pasha tried to explain who they were and their duties. However, Mustafa Kemal Pasha interrupted the conversation immediately and he expressed that he recognize neither the İstanbul Government nor themselves as members of such a government. Moreover, Mustafa Kemal emphasized not to carry on a conversation with the deputation of İstanbul if they insisted to appear at this negotiation in their posts as “Ministers of a Government in İstanbul.” In fact, Mustafa Kemal had taken over the presidency and the administration of the negotiation with this move. Thereupon, they agreed to proceed to an exchange of opinion without touching the question of respective positions and authority.⁶³⁰

After a long silence, İzzet Pasha started to talk about the Mondros Armistice and its terrible conditions. He mentioned that the occupying states had not obeyed the conditions of the Armistice the after his resignation. Then, he expresses that “the Greeks can no longer live in Anatolia; they have to leave. Allied powers have understood and appreciated it, and they desire to make peace with us seriously.”⁶³¹ These words proved that İstanbul was still incapable of realizing the facts and they

⁶²⁹ *Anadolu’da Yeni Gün*, No.450-70, 3 Teşrin-i Sani 1336 [03.11.1920], p. 1.

⁶³⁰ Murat Aydoğdu, “Mütareke Döneminin Son İstanbul Hükümeti – Son Ahmet Tevfik Paşa Hükümeti (21 Ekim 1920-4 Kasım 1922)”, (U.D.D.), (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi, 2016), p. 193; Atatürk, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 357.

⁶³¹ Ahmet İzzet Pasha, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 98.

were in lack of foresight. In response to these explanations, Mustafa Kemal Pasha gave the following answer:

The English have deceived you. You have moved as credulous, and you have come here in vain. In fact, there is no positive proposal in the words you say. We declare the İstanbul Government null and void. I meet you personally, not an official title. As you said, if the of peace comes, there is no doubt that they will call and find us.⁶³²

Mustafa Kemal explicitly said that the real interlocutor of the Ankara Government was the Allied powers, not İstanbul. He saw the İstanbul Government as illegitimate power. In that way, he also emphasized that he did not approve the Treaty of Sevres signed by the İstanbul Government on August 10, 1920.

It can be seen that at the Bilecik meeting, the main purpose of the deputation of İstanbul was to force the Ankara Government to ratify the Sevres Treaty. Yunus Nadi (Abalıoğlu) also confirmed this claim with the following statements:

It is impossible for what is called the Anatolian struggle to reach a positive conclusion. ...it is more reasonable to rescue available territories by making more possible as a good peace than devastating the country totally and putting the future in jeopardy by running after a dream. Let's give up the fight and get the possible peace.⁶³³

During the course of the negotiations lasted for several hours, it became evident that the deputation had no fixed information or convictions. Also, it was revealed that they could not understand the purpose and essence of the National movement, and could not know why they came to Bilecik.⁶³⁴ Mustafa Kemal Pasha said to the delegation of İstanbul that it will be harmful for us if you take part in the İstanbul Government. Therefore, he detained the members of deputation against their will, and took them to Ankara on December 6, 1920.⁶³⁵ *Anadolu'da Yeni Gün* published a news about the delegation under the title of *Our Guests From İstanbul*. The newspaper also shared the photographs of İzzet Pasha, Salih Pasha and Hüseyin

⁶³² "İngilizler sizi aldatmışlardır. Safdillikle hareket etmişsiniz ve buraya kadar beyhude gelmişsiniz. Esasen söylediğiniz sözlerde de müspet bir teklif yoktur. Bizce İstanbul Hükümeti yoktur; sizinle resmî sıfatı haiz kimseler gibi değil, şahsî ve hususî bir mahiyette görüşüyorum. Deddiğiniz gibi sulh zamanı gelmişse onların bizi arayıp bulacaklarında bir şüphe yoktur." Bilgin, *Ibid.*, p. 176.

⁶³³ Quoted from Bilgin, *Ibid.*, p. 176.

⁶³⁴ Kılıç Ali, (Süleyman Asaf Emrullah), *Kılıç Ali'nin Anıları*, Comp. By Hulusi Turgut, (İstanbul: TİBKY, 2007), p. 141.

⁶³⁵ Ahmet İzzet Pasha, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 100-102; Atatürk, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 358.

Kazım Bey and elaborated the news as follows: “Our new guests coming from İstanbul to Ankara yesterday were passionately welcomed. Anatolia is proud of embracing its new and precious children who are involved in the defense of the legitimate cause.”⁶³⁶

As it can be understood that the newspaper reflected the situation as though the İstanbul delegation preferred to participate in the National movement. However, Mustafa Kemal forced the members of the delegation to come Ankara inspite of their unwillingness.⁶³⁷

Moreover, *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* announced the arrival of the İstanbul delegation in Ankara with the title of *the New Friends of Anatolian Movement*. The newspaper claimed that “the members of the İstanbul delegation came to Anatolia in order to defend determinedly the Anatolian case against the enemies together with Anatolian people.” The newspaper continued its statements: “Many honorable people, waiting for an opportunity to come to Anatolia as soon as possible, decided to take advantage of this opportunity and they set off under the pretext of reconciliation negotiations.”⁶³⁸

Like *Anadolu’da Yeni Gün*, *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* also informed the people that as if members of the İstanbul delegataion acknowledged the legitimacy of the National movement and joined the National cause.⁶³⁹ As it was explained above, the newspapers gave information about the delegation to the people in accordance with the instructions of Mustafa Kemal.

To detain the deputation of İstanbul was significant political move in terms of destiny of the National Struggle. First of all, if Anatolia learnt that a reconciliation

⁶³⁶ *Anadolu’da Yeni Gün*, No.472-92, 7 Kanun-i Evvel 1336 [07.12.1920], p. 1.

⁶³⁷ Mustafa Kemal in fact intended to make use of İzzet Pasha, Salih Pasha and the others in the favor of the National movement. Hence, he issued a telegraph, saying that the members of the İstanbul delegation escaped from the malignity of English to Anatolia and they took refuge in the safekeeping of the nation. Henceforth, they would work more effectively and fruitfully for the welfare and the salvation of the country. Ahmet İzzet Pasha, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 100-102; Atatürk, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 358; Bilgin, *Ibid.*, p. 177; Aydoğdu, *Ibid.*, p. 197.

⁶³⁸ *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, No.83, 7 Kanun-i Evvel 1336 [07.12.1920], p. 1.

⁶³⁹ Hasan Türker, “Tevfik Paşa Hükümeti’nin Anadolu ile Uzlaşma Arayışı ve Bilecik Buluşmasının Basındaki Yansımaları (1920)”, *Çağdaş Türkiye Tarihi Araştırmaları Dergisi*, XVII/34 (2017-Bahar), p. 87.

deputation came from İstanbul, the army, which began to be newly organized, could be depressed and could hesitate in obedience of instruction. If the people of Anatolia, who were tired of war, understood that the reconciliation could not be achieved, the motivation of the people could be further deteriorated. However, if it was announced that these people had come to Anatolia to participate in the National Struggle, the determination of Anatolian people for struggle could be increased. Also, the confidence of the people for Ankara could be reassured. In fact, the expected result was obtained and the motivation of people in Anatolia had risen to a great extent.⁶⁴⁰

Approximately three months later, the Ankara Government allowed the members of İstanbul delegation to return İstanbul. *Anadolu'da Yeni Gün* announced that the leaving of the delegation for İstanbul:

The delagation, which had reached Ankara on December 6, 1920, has been living in the mansion allocated to them since that day. Some rumors began to spread suddenly yesterday that the delegation would return to İstanbul. As a result of the investigations we have conducted, we have learned that Hüseyin Kazım and Cevat Pasha and Fatin Efendi will move today and İzzet and Salih pashas will depart from our city tomorrow by route of İnebolu.⁶⁴¹

⁶⁴⁰ Aytepe, *Ibid.*, p. 29.

⁶⁴¹ *Anadolu'da Yeni Gün*, No.549-170, 7 Mart 1337 [07.03.1921], p. 1. Ahmet İzzet Paşa, *Ibid.*, Vol II, p. 107. The members of the deputation did not feel at home in Ankara, and they refrained from entering the service of the National State. They continually appealed to the Nationalists, directly or indirectly, begging to be released and to be allowed to return to their families in İstanbul. Also, İzzet Pasha did not accept the recommendation made to go to London as the representative of Ankara not to annoy the English. The delegation was allowed to return to İstanbul on March 7, 1921, since they gave verbal and written assurances that they would leave their duties in the İstanbul Government. The delegation arrived İstanbul on March 19, 1921, in two groups every other day. Only Münir (Erteğün) Bey stayed in Ankara. Others involved in the members of Cabinet in İstanbul. See Atatürk, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 409-411; Aytepe, *Ibid.*, p. 30.

CHAPTER 4

DIPLOMATIC AND MILITARY ASPECTS OF LEGITIMACY OF TURKISH NATIONAL STRUGGLE

4.1. The Diplomatic Relations of the Ankara Government With the Allied Powers and Soviet Russia

4.1.1. The Initial Contacts of Representative Committee With the Allied Powers

4.1.1.1. The Turkish Nationalists and the USA

From the Erzurum Congress (July 23, 1919 - August 4, 1919) till the opening of the GNA (April 23, 1920), the Representative Committee, which carried on the duty of de facto government in Anatolia, attempted to establish relations with foreign states in order to spread the influence of the National movement and to achieve the national goals and desires. At this point, the United States was one of the great powers that the Representative Committee kept in touch. In September 1919, an American committee, headed by American General James G. Harbord, made a study visit to explore the possibility of building a mandate system over Armenia. On September 20, 1919, the delegation met with the leaders of the National movement in Sivas.⁶⁴²

On September 22, 1919, American delegation held a secret meeting with the Nationalists. Mustafa Kemal gave information about the purpose of the National resistance, how the national unity would be established, the attitudes of the Turks towards non-Muslim elements, and the propaganda of some foreigners, such as British agent Major Noel, against the Nationalists in Anatolia.⁶⁴³

⁶⁴² Salahi R. Sonyel, *Türk Kurtuluş Savaşı ve Dış Politika, Vol. I*, (Ankara: TTK, 1973), p. 159.

⁶⁴³ Sonyel, *Türk Kurtuluş Savaşı ve...* p. 159; Atatürk, *Ibid.*, Vol, I, pp. 118-119.

After the negotiations, Mustafa Kemal sent a telegraph to Kazım Karabekir, saying that General Harbord adopted that the cause of Turkish Nationalists was legitimate. Mustafa Kemal expressed that he was satisfied with the result of the meeting.⁶⁴⁴

Moreover, Mustafa Kemal, in a telegram sent to Colonel Osman in Kastamonu and Lieutenant Governor, Ferit Bey, informed that the delegation of General Harbord stated that the National movement was in conformity with the Constitution and that the Central Government was weak and conflicting with the Constitution. In addition, he reported that the delegation had elucidated the İstanbul Government that there was no other solution than accepting the goals of the Anatolian Resistance and the justified cause of the National Forces.⁶⁴⁵

The committee of General Harbord had great influence on the leaders of the National movement. The Nationalists appreciated this military delegation; because the American delegation provided the propaganda of the National movement in the international arena. Indeed, General Harbord described the importance of the Anatolian movement to the American people and argued that the movement was an important force which had to be taken into consideration in terms of a definite solution to the Eastern question. Since then, the American political and military representatives in Turkey had begun to recognize the Turkish Nationalists as representatives of the Turkish people.⁶⁴⁶

4.1.1.2. The Turkish Nationalists and Britain

In the first phase of the National movement, the attitude of the Nationalists towards the Britain was the same as that towards the other Allied powers. Nevertheless, after the Greek invasion of İzmir and especially after the incident of Major Noel, these relations began to change in the negative, but not yet reached the point of tension. The British military representative in Cairo, Colonel Meinertzhagen, sent a telegram to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on October 7, 1919, reporting that “Mustafa

⁶⁴⁴ Atatürk'ün Tamim, Telgraf ve Beyannameleri, p. 80; Karabekir, *İstiklal Harbimiz*, Vol. I, p. 520.

⁶⁴⁵ Kansu, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 313.

⁶⁴⁶ Sonyel, *Türk Kurtuluş Savaşı ve...* p. 162.

Kemal would not be hostile to the Britain if the British agents did not provoke the people against the nationalists.’’⁶⁴⁷

According to British documents, the British Ministry of Defense supported to reach an agreement with Mustafa Kemal and Nationalists, but the British Foreign Office did not adopt this view. For the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, it was to do business behind the other Allied powers without the knowledge of them and the peace would be signed with Turkey would mean to disregard completely.⁶⁴⁸

The British Foreign Office was trying to establish an unofficial and indirect relationship with Mustafa Kemal through some British officers, despite this allusive formal hostility to the Turkish National movement. From these officers, Lieutenant-Colonel Rawlinson met Mustafa Kemal during the course of the Erzurum Congress and then sent a report about the situation in Anatolia on August 11, 1919. Rawlinson said that Mustafa Kemaş rejected the Bolshevism and he was also opposed to cooperate with Enver Pasha. According to thoughts of Rawlinson, ‘‘the National movement had great chance of success; creating an Amenia by partitioning the country was required a large number of the Allied forces. In fact, the Armenians bited a large piece that they could not chewed.’’⁶⁴⁹

Rawlinson also met with Kazım Karabekir in Erzurum. He told that Lord Curzon thought that the peace was impossible because there was no strong government in Turkey. Therefore, Curzon also needed Mustafa Kemal, the winner of the nation's trust, to attend the Peace Conference or to accept decisions of the Conference. In addition, Rawlinson said to Karabekir that Britain would provide Turkey economic development by guaranteeing the existence and independence of the country.⁶⁵⁰

On the other hand, from an officer of the British High Commissioner, Andrew Ryan, a close friend of Damat Ferid and a Turkish enemy, proposed a divide and rule policy of Britain against the Turkish Nationalists. He did not approve the ‘‘tolerance politics’’ of the Allies towards the Nationalists and the thought this policy had

⁶⁴⁷ Sonyel, *Türk Kurtuluş Savaşı ve...* p. 163.

⁶⁴⁸ Sonyel, *Türk Kurtuluş Savaşı ve...* p. 163.

⁶⁴⁹ Sonyel, *İngiliz İstihbarat Servisi'nin Türkiye'deki Eylemleri*, pp. 30-31.

⁶⁵⁰ Karabekir, *İstiklal Harbimiz*, Vol. II, pp. 843-845; Gökbilgin, *Ibid.*, pp. 533-537.

already bankrupt. As a matter of fact, he supported the coming of Damat Ferid into power on condition that the Allies would correct and facilitate the situation.⁶⁵¹

4.1.1.3. The Turkish Nationalists and France

Since the beginning of the National movement, it was a known fact that the French had wanted to compromise with the Nationalists. There were many reasons for this. The French were extremely opposed to Britain. Due to the British power and superiority, the French were afraid of losing their situation in the Near and Middle East. In their opinions, the purpose of the British policy was to make Turkey as a fortress on the way to India; or to make Turkey a new Egypt. In the face of these developments, the French considered Turkish National resistance as the only basis against the British policies. For this reason, they wanted to make a deal with the Nationalist leaders. In fact, they secretly supported the establishment of a “Society of the Friends of French” which would be a rival to the the Society of the Friends of England in Istanbul.⁶⁵²

In addition, de France, the French High Commissioner, and Franchet d'Esperey, Commander of the French Forces, were accused many times for being anti-British and helping the Turks in all respects. In a telegram sent to the French Government, the d'Esperey suggested that leading the way of Turkish National resistance would best serve purpose of France. Moreover, the French Government also believed that the division of Anatolia would damage the French interests and French wanted to establish the Turkish sovereignty in Anatolia.⁶⁵³

Mustafa Kemal was aware of the true intentions of the France and kept the relations with them secret for the safety of the National movement. However, attempts of the friendship with the French did not last long. Urfa, Antep, and Maras, which had been occupied by Britain in accordance with the Mondros Armistice, were transferred to

⁶⁵¹ Sonyel, *Türk Kurtuluş Savaşı ve...* p. 166.

⁶⁵² Ahmet Emin Yalman, *Turkey in My Time*, (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1956), pp. 71-72.

⁶⁵³ Sonyel, *Türk Kurtuluş Savaşı ve...* pp. 195-196.

France with the Treaty of Syria dated September 15, 1919. At the beginning of November in 1919, the French invaded the Cilicia region. The Nationalists reacted strongly and the sense of intimacy with the French was entirely removed.⁶⁵⁴ Mustafa Kemal Pasha sent a telegraph SDR of Erzurum on November 6, 1919, saying that the French occupation of Cilicia region was contrary to the terms of Mondros Armistice and legal rules. He also informed that the Central Government protested the occupation to the Allies and the people in the region started demonstrations against the Allies and they tried to announce the integrity of the Ottoman homeland. Mustafa Kemal asked SDR of Erzurum to send protest telegraphs to the representatives of Allies.⁶⁵⁵

In addition, Mustafa Kemal Pasha sent a telegraph to Bekir Sami Bey in Bursa and said that, a state that inflicted the Armenians, who were living in Adana, upon the Nationalists and occupied Urfa, Antep, and Maraş had never been a friend.⁶⁵⁶ Additionally, *İrade-i Milliye* published a communique issued by Mustafa Kemal on November 16, 1919, on behalf of the Representative Committee. According to the newspaper, Mustafa Kemal generally referred to the following points: “The Allied powers did not abandon their policies to deprive Turkey of its most beautiful lands and that they continued the occupation as they wish without waiting for the outcome of the Peace Conference.” He also stressed that such initiatives were contrary to the sense of justice and that the Allies violated the Article XII of Wilson Principles. Finally, Mustafa Kemal Pasha warned: “The Turkish nation will continue with determination to defend its existence and its traditional rights with all its material and spiritual powers, rather than it consents to be enslaved.”⁶⁵⁷

The Turkish people began to send telegraphs protesting the French from all over the country to İstanbul. For this reason, Georges Picot, the French High Commissioner in Syria, went to Sivas in December 1919, in order to hold informal negotiations with Mustafa Kemal. While he was on his way, he met with Ali Fuat Pasha in Kayseri.

⁶⁵⁴ Özkaya... [et al.]; Milli Mücadele Tarihi..., Vol. I, pp. 273-278; Gökbilgin, *Ibid.*, p. 183.

⁶⁵⁵ Atatürk'ün Tamim Telgraf ve Beyannameleri, p. 124.

⁶⁵⁶ Sonyel, *Türk Kurtuluş Savaşı ve...* pp. 197; Miralay Bekir Sami Günsav'ın Kurtuluş Savaşı anıları, Prep. By Muhittin Ünal, (İstanbul: Cem Yayınevi, 1994), p. 214.

⁶⁵⁷ *İrade-i Milliye*, No.12, 17 Teşrin-i Sani 1335 [17.11.1919], p. 1. For further information, See Atatürk'ün Tamim Telgraf ve Beyannameleri, pp. 124-125.

Picot promised that France would pursue peace policy and try to establish a strong and independent Turkish state in the Middle East, which was composed of the majority of the Turks.⁶⁵⁸

When Picot met with Mustafa Kemal in Sivas, he said that came by command of Aristide Briand, who would be Prime Minister in France. He added that Briand wanted to deal with Mustafa Kemal and to leave Adana, Antep, and Urfa to Turkish administration in return of some financial privileges. Mustafa Kemal explicitly told that France was obliged to bring to end of the occupation; otherwise all Turkish people would fight for Cilicia. Thereupon, Picot replied that France supported the independence of the Ottoman State and French would withdraw from the occupied regions. He asked Mustafa Kemal to avoid a counter revolt in Cilicia. Mustafa Kemal assured him that Muslim people would not attack if the French and Armenians did not create trouble.⁶⁵⁹ The meeting of Mustafa Kemal Pasha and Georges Picot in Sivas did not yield a result. On the other hand, the fact that a French High Commissioner came to meet with the leaders of the National movement raised the power and prestige of the Turkish Nationalists. The Nationalists interpreted this event in a way informal recognition of the Turkish National movement by the French Government.⁶⁶⁰

The French had a dispute with the Britain. Being aware of everything, Mustafa Kemal Pasha wanted to benefit this dispute politically; thus, he did not react much the demands of Picot. Mustafa Kemal planned to gain the support of France by separating it from the other Allied powers. For this reason, he sent a telegram on December 8, 1919, to Hüsnü Effendi, Mufti of Urfa. Mustafa Kemal believed that the French who occupied the area unfairly would withdraw after a while. Moreover, he emphasized that as long as the Armenians and the French did not take action, the Turkish people should not go on the armed attack.⁶⁶¹

The Nationalists leaders tried to solve the problems in Southeastern Anatolia with the political channels, but the French authorities broke their promises and they armed

⁶⁵⁸ Ali Fuat Cebesoy, *Moskova Hatıraları*, (İstanbul: Vatan Neşriyat, 1955), p. 10.

⁶⁵⁹ Atatürk'ün Tamim, Telgraf ve Beyannameleri, pp. 130-131.

⁶⁶⁰ Kansu, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 459-461; Sonyel, *Türk Kurtuluş Savaşı ve...* pp. 198-199.

⁶⁶¹ Atatürk'ün Tamim Telgraf ve Beyannameleri, pp. 133 and 137.

Armenians and allowed them to assault and loot the Turkish villages. Also, they overlooked killing of many Turks by Armenians.⁶⁶² Especially, In February 1920, there were bloodsheds between Turks and French and armed Armenians in the Southeastern Anatolia. As is known, at that time, there was a national struggle in Adana, Maraş, Urfa and Antep against the French occupation forces and their collaborator; or Armenians. In particular, the Armenians provided all kinds of support to the French occupation forces and practiced implementations such as oppression, humiliation, extortion and killing against the Turkish people in these provinces. This situation increased the resistance ambition of the people living in this region against the occupations, especially the people in Maraş, and started a very violent and bloody struggle against France and Armenians. It was argued that, in the whole operation, approximately fifteen or twenty thousands Armenians lost their lives. In other words, Turks killed approximately twenty thousands Armenians.⁶⁶³ In the end, the French were forced to retreat from Maraş on February 12, 1920. The withdrawal of French from Maraş was the first move in a reversal of French policy which would lead to the ultimate evacuation of all Cilicia.⁶⁶⁴

On March 13, 1920, *Tasvir-i Efkar* published a speech delivered by Lord Curzon in the House of Commons. He made following comments regarding to the events in Zeytun and Maraş:

...After the Armistice, Great Britain occupied Cilicia. We did not consider constant presence in Cilicia occupied by the victories and successes of our troops, so we handed over the region and the Syrian coast to the French. However, after the second half of January, we were informed that there was turmoil in the region and we made attempts in the presence of the Turkish Government and France. Because, Maraş, Zeytun and in the close locations, the Turkish Revolt appeared and two Americans were killed. The massacre in the Armenian territories had begun before the rebellion against the French. The French had been kept under blockade for three weeks there, and then they had to retreat...⁶⁶⁵

⁶⁶² Laurence Evans, *Türkiye'nin Parçalanması ve ABD Politikası, (1914-1924)*, Trans. By. T. Alaya, N. Uğurlu, (İstanbul: Milliyet Yayınları, 1972), p. 259-260.

⁶⁶³ Armaoğlu, *Ibid.*, pp. 473-474; Sonyel, *Türk Kurtuluş Savaşı ve...* p. 199; Özkaya... [et al.]; *Milli Mücadele Tarihi...*, Vol. I, p. 294.

⁶⁶⁴ Kinross, *Ibid.*, p. 204; Atatürk, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 307.

⁶⁶⁵ *Tasvir-i Efkar*, No.3011, 13 Mart 1336 [13.03.1920], p. 1.

As it is seen that Lord Curzon summarized the events from the very beginning and he expressed that Turks killed Armenians in Maraş and its environment. Also, he implied that the French could not handle the occupation.

The British press published similar news that accused the Nationalists of causing unrest in the Southeastern Anatolia and it deemed them responsible for killing Armenians in the region. *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* shared this news in the issue dated as April 23, 1920. In the news, the opposition group in England claimed that “although the Turkish army was demobilized after the Armistice, their weapons were not taken out of their hands. Thus, this prepared the ground for creating today’s mixed situation. In addition, the opposition put forward that Mustafa Kemal had a program aimed at killing all the Christians who reside in Cilicia. Lord Curzon replied to these criticisms of the opposition party on behalf of the government. Finally he said to agree with the allegations of the opposition party: “...The events of Cilicia started in January. These events resulted from the programs of the Young Turks (implied to Nationalists). This is doubtlessly clear thing.”⁶⁶⁶

In reality, Turks suffered more casualties than French and Armenians. Even foreign representatives accepted this fact. In a report sent by Admiral Bristol, the American High Commissioner in İstanbul, to American Government, it was argued that rumors about the events in Maraş were exaggerated for political reasons by the Allied powers, which wanted to divide Turkey, in order to justify their efforts to establish an independent Armenia.⁶⁶⁷ Additionally, the representatives of the Allied powers at the First Conference of London were aware that the claim of killing twenty thousand Armenians was a lie and fiction.⁶⁶⁸

4.1.1.4. The Turkish Nationalists and Italy

The Nationalists saw the Italians as a moderate and fair nation that regretted occupations. The Italians tried to gain friends among Turks and to spread their

⁶⁶⁶ *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, No.24, 23 Nisan 1336 [23.04.1920], p. 3. From *Times*.

⁶⁶⁷ Evans, *Ibid.*, p. 260.

⁶⁶⁸ Ulubelen, *Ibid.*, p. 209; Tansel, *Ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 39.

influences because the Greek occupation of İzmir, which had been promised to Italians, created a deep indignation over them as well as the Turks. Hence, Italy decided to support the Anatolian Resistance and to prevent İzmir and its surroundings from being left to the Greeks.⁶⁶⁹ The Italians also shared the confidential information with the Nationalists. Generally, Mustafa Kemal received reliable information from Italian sources about the aims and plans of the Allied powers. For example, the Italians informed the Nationalists beforehand about the Allied occupation of İstanbul and possible arresting of the nationalist and patriotic people in İstanbul.⁶⁷⁰

Apart from these, the Italians, who encouraged the gangs against the Greeks, supported the Nationalists with the weapons and ammunition. On the one hand, the nationalist representatives in Rome held informal negotiations with the Italian Government; on the other hand, they secretly interested in the purchase of weapons and ammunition. The Italian ships brought the ammunition at ports of Söke, Antalya and other and weapons and other ordnances were distributed to the National forces.⁶⁷¹

Italian official officers and representatives were sympathetic to the Nationalists. Especially the Italian representative Kont Sforza was a Turkish friend. He continued this friendship until the end of his life. Kont Caprini, who was engaged in administrative affairs under command of Sforza, was also a Turkish friend. . Thanks to the superior efforts of these two Turkish friends, many officers and civilian members of the National Defense Group (Müdafaa-i Milli (MM)) and the underground organizations during the National Struggle period were smuggled to Anatolia by the passports of the Italian Government.⁶⁷²

Briefly, during the period of National Struggle, the Italians followed a reconciliatory policy towards the Nationalists. In reponse to the attitude of Italians, the Nationalists

⁶⁶⁹ Hüsamettin Ertürk, *İki Devrin Perde Arkası*, comp. By Samih Nafiz Tansu, (İstanbul: Pınar Yayınevi, 1964), p. 406.

⁶⁷⁰ Sonyel, *Türk Kurtuluş Savaşı ve...* p. 167; Atatürk'ün Tamim Telgraf ve Beyannameleri, pp. 166-167.

⁶⁷¹ Sonyel, *Türk Kurtuluş Savaşı ve...* p. 168.

⁶⁷² Ertürk, *Ibid.*, p. 408.

tried to pursue leniency policy towards them. They want to compromise with the Turks and supported the establishment of the peace as soon as possible.⁶⁷³

Lastly, Vitelli, who was Italian liaison officer in Anatolia, sent a report his Government April 22, 1920. This report included extremely important information in terms of the legitimacy of the National movement. He expressed the following statements in his report:

The only party to be given importance in Turkey is party of Mustafa Kemal because it is supported by the nation that is far from the foreign intrigue and influence in Anatolia. The Kemalists dedicated themselves to realize the Turkish national ideal. Any Turkish Government, which wants to stay in the post and to rely on a strong party, will eventually have to negotiate with Mustafa Kemal. Therefore, the Italian Government must convince the Allied powers to reach an agreement with him. Many difficulties will be overcome if an agreement with him is achieved.⁶⁷⁴

4.1.2. San Remo Conference and the Sevres Project of the Allies

The year of 1920 was full of many challenges in terms of the destiny of the Turkish National Struggle. From January onwards, internal revolts had reached its peak in Anatolia, when the Greeks attacks speed up from the Western Front in June. On the one hand, the Government of the GNA was fighting against the Greeks; on the other hand, it tried to suppress the internal revolts in order to fortify its authority.

While this inexorable struggle between İstanbul and Anatolia, and the Greeks and Anatolia was continuing at full speed, the Allies also fell out with each other to actualize their demands on the Ottoman Empire. The “Problem of Turkey” was brought to the agenda in the First Conference of London on February 12, 1920. At the conference, although France and Italy were willing to be evacuated İzmir immediately by the Greeks, the Britain certainly rejected this idea.⁶⁷⁵ Eventually, the Allied powers adjourned the London Conference, which carried on its works until April 10, 1920, for re-convening at San Remo, in Italy. The last meeting on Turkish

⁶⁷³ Ertürk, *Ibid.*, p. 410; Sonyel, *Türk Kurtuluş Savaşı ve...* p. 170.

⁶⁷⁴ Sonyel, *Türk Kurtuluş Savaşı ve...* p. 169-170.

⁶⁷⁵ For the meeting resolutions of the London Conference of 14 February - 21 March 1920, See Ulubelen, *Ibid.*, pp. 205-216.

peace was held in San Remo between the dates of 18-26 April, 1920. The Supreme Council, composed of Allied leaders as well as Japan, Greece and USA, determined the final plan to partition the Ottoman Empire at the end of the eight day-negotiations and thus, they put down on paper the main principles of the Sevres Treaty, which would be reached final form at Sevres in Switzerland.⁶⁷⁶ In the meantime, the Allies summoned the officials of the İstanbul Government to Paris so as to sign the peace treaty that they had arranged in San Remo. Upon this invitation, Damat Ferid Pasha sent a delegation to Paris under the presidency of the former Grand Vizier Tevfik Pasha.

The draft agreement imposing very severe conditions on Anatolia was prepared entirely by the Allied powers without any negotiations with the delegates of the Ottoman Government. The draft of the treaty was also published in nationalist newspapers like *İkdam* and *Açıksöz*. According to the narrations of the newspapers, Turkish peace conditions were briefly as follows: *The Ottoman Dynasty was being allowed to remain in İstanbul*. In return for this, the İstanbul Government promised to accept fully and sincerely the concessions recognized to the minorities, take measures against the liberation movement emerging in Anatolia, and crush it by sending troops there. In addition, the Straits would be put under the administration of an international commission, which would have its own flag and budget, and the Ottoman delegate would take part in its meetings only as an observer. The Straits would be kept open to the ships of all countries even in time of war. Apart from these, the large part of territory in the South of Anatolia such as Iraq, Syria and Arabia, which the Ottoman Empire had lost during the War, were being completely abandoned. While Iraq and Palestine went to protectorate of England; Adana with its surrounding, Syria and Lebanon became mandate of France. Southwestern Anatolia, including Antalya fallen under the influence of Italy. Additionally, the large part of Western Anatolia with İzmir and almost whole Thrace would be given to Greece; in the region of Southeastern Anatolia would be established an independent Kurdish State, and in the Eastern Anatolia would be established an independent Armenia.

⁶⁷⁶ For the protocols of the San Remo Conference, See Osman Olcay, *Sevres Andlaşmasına Doğru (Çeşitli Konferans ve Toplantıların Tutanaqları...)*, 100. Doğum Yılında Atatürk'e Armağan Dizisi, (Ankara: Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayınları, 1981), pp. 445-586.

Trabzon would be left to Armenia and became its exit to the sea. The port of Batum would also form a sea exit to Georgia, Azerbaijan, Armenia and Iran. Furthermore, Turkey would not have an army: the military forces of the Ottoman Empire were being reduced and placed under the command of the Allied powers. All states, which participated in the League of Nations, would be able to make use of the ports of Haydarpaşa, İzmir, İskenderun, Hayfa, Basra, Trabzon and Batum.⁶⁷⁷

The Supreme Council, with a brief ceremony was held on May 11, 1920, presented the draft of the Sevres Treaty to the Ottoman delegates. When Tevfik Pasha saw the peace conditions, as his first comment, he said that *the Allied peace terms were incompatible with the continued existence of an independent Ottoman State*.⁶⁷⁸ The text of the Sevres Treaty arrived İstanbul almost seventeen days later. However, as soon as the peace conditions were announced in Ankara and İstanbul, whole of Turkey was deplored.⁶⁷⁹

The decisions taken at the San Remo Conference formed the basis of the Sevres Treaty. In that time, the press was closely following the San Remo Conference and developments. Although the Conference resolutions were signed on August 10, 1920, the discussions and interpretations of the peace conditions began from the end of April 1920, and continued until the beginning of August. The fact that the press closely followed the developments in the conference shows us that San Remo decisions had taken an important place in the international relations. For this reason, it is necessary to elaborate on the manner of reception of decisions taken in the Conference and the criticisms made on it, to certain extent which they take place in the press.

A nationalist newspaper in İstanbul, *Vakit* published an article on April 27, 1920, about the decisions of San Remo Conference. The newspaper was pleased with that İstanbul was left as the capital of the Ottoman Government, as it used to be. It also

⁶⁷⁷ *İkdam*, No.8311, 3 Mayıs 1336 [03.05.1920], p. 1; *Açıksöz*, No.48, 23 Mayıs 1336 [23.05.1920], p. 1. For further information, See Cemil Bilsel, *Lozan*, Vol. I., (İstanbul: Sosyal Yayınlar, 1998), pp. 305-321.

⁶⁷⁸ Andrew Mango, *From the Sultan to Atatürk: Turkey*, (London: Haus, 2009), p. 94.

⁶⁷⁹ Yuluğ Tekin Kurat, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Paylaşılması*, (Ankara: Kalite Matbaası, 1976), p. 57; Jaeschke, *İngiliz Belgeleri*, p. 201.

mentioned that the anticipations about Arabia, Iraq, Syria, and Armenia could be made acceptable for the sides by an effective foreign policy. According to the newspaper, the most important problem that would make the situation of the Ottoman delegates most difficult was that whether or not, a successful defense related to being limited the demands of the Greeks on İzmir and Thrace. Vakit noted that the only thing that Turkey expected from the San Remo Conference was justice. In addition, it was emphasized that the justice expected at the Peace Conference should not be perceived in the sense of the application of a punishment because it completely revealed that Turkey had been deceived with respect to participating in the First World War. According to the editorial, the solution seemed possible in a way of leaving some regions within the Ottoman borders by making some changes in the resolutions determined at the San Remo Conference.⁶⁸⁰

An anti-nationalist newspaper, *Peyam-ı Sabah*, which supported the Damat Ferid Pasha cabinets, regarded the Anatolian movement responsible for the extremely heavy conditions of peace treaty. It expressed that “the mischief and tricks of the followers of the CUP, called the National Forces, caused to make the peace conditions so heavy.” The newspaper, which claimed that the leaders of National movement were in close cooperation with the prominent members of the CUP such as Enver, Nuri, and Halil Pasha, suggested that the way to be followed in order to provide some changes in the peace conditions:

We are confident that big states will recognize our rights sooner or later... It is necessary to respect the legitimate rights of the Turks to ensure peace and tranquility in the East. For this, it is imperative not to separate İzmir from Anatolia and not to deprive İstanbul of Thrace.⁶⁸¹

Moreover, the newspaper stated that the path, which had been pursued so far, should be abandoned and that it should be done like that:

Putting the methods of justice and truth, order and regularity to one side, just as the despots do, means losing our national rights with our own hands... the fact that Damat Ferid Pasha has come to power in such last minutes is a blessing for. God

⁶⁸⁰ *Vakit*, No.885, 27 Nisan 1336 [27.04.1920], p. 1.

⁶⁸¹ *Peyam-ı Sabah*, No.134, 14 Mayıs 1336 [14.05.1920], p. 1.

Forbid! What would we have done what if were Ali Rıza Pasha or Salih Pasha still in power?⁶⁸²

It is clear that anti-nationalist newspaper still continued to trust the justice of the Allied powers and recommended Turkish people to trust them. In addition, the newspaper insisted on its argument that the National Forces were continuations of the CUP and the Allies forced the Turks to accept heavy peace treaty, which they did not deserve, because of the illegitimate actions of Nationalists.

On May 15, 1920, *İkdam* published an editorial commenting on the decisions of San Remo. The newspaper reminded that *it is impossible to maintain life as the State and the nation* just as Tevfik Pasha, the president of the Ottoman delegation, had already expressed that the peace terms were *absolutely incompatible with the notions of state and independence*. Also, it was mentioned that the peace conditions related to land, borders and independence affected our idea and soul as a vital issue for us. *İkdam* argued that “if there were no significant changes to the conditions of Western borders, the administration of İstanbul and its environments, it would be unnecessary to discuss and negotiation for other conditions.” The article reacted to the leaving of the Western and Eastern Thrace to the Greece, and also brought forward that the peace terms were contradictory to the peace treaties made with the other defeated nations. Because in the treaties made by other defeated countries, the wishes and tendencies of the local majority were taken into consideration. *İkdam*, which welcomed the decisions of remaining of İstanbul as the capital of the state and of recognizing the sovereignty of the Sultan, asserted that “administration of İstanbul and surrounding by an International Commission, which did not include the Ottoman State, was not compatible with the concept of state and independence. At the same time, it seemed impossible to implement the conditions as they were.”⁶⁸³

⁶⁸² *Peyam-ı Sabah*, No.134, 14 Mayıs 1336 [14.05.1920], p. 1. For the similar news, See *Peyam-ı Sabah*, No.121, 01 Mayıs 1336 [01.05.1920], p. 1.

⁶⁸³ *İkdam*, No.8323, 15 Mayıs 1336 [15.05.1920], 1. While the text of the Treaty was being translated into Turkish, Tevfik Pasha sent a telegram to Grand Vizier Damat Ferid Pasha in İstanbul. In his telegram, Tevfik Pasha told his impressions about the peace terms as follows: “As the peace terms proposed aimed at nothing but the overthrowing of the Ottoman State and putting an end to the divine right of the Sultan, the survival of the State depends on the alteration of the provisions of the Treaty as a whole. In view of the fact that the proposed Peace Treaty would reduce the Ottoman State into a dominion under the joint hegemony of the Entente Powers, no peace could be established unless this treaty is changed so as to guarantee the freedom of the country and the

As it is seen that *İkdam* welcomed the decisions of the conference about İstanbul and the sovereignty of the Sultan; however, it completely rejected the unjust decisions of the Allies about the independence and integrity of the homeland. Additionally, it is worth mentioning in the news that although the newspaper meticulously focused on the conditions of the Sevres Treaty relevant to İstanbul and Thrace, it did not touch on the issues such as the establishment of an Armenian State on a large piece of land in the East, leaving of almost all the Arab countries out of the border and the project of establishment of Kurdistan as buffer state in the South.

Vakit, which suggested in the news publishing immediately afterwards of the Conference that the peace terms should be perceived as a “punishment”, and it wrote the exact opposite claim. The newspaper in this article, argued that the conditions of peace were the “sentence of death” for the Ottoman State. The newspaper put forward that this allegation stemmed from the provisions about Thrace and İzmir. Furthermore, according to the newspaper, the decision of the fact that the Ottoman State did not have a representative in the international inspection commission called “the Bosphorus Commission” was interpreted as the removal of the İstanbul Government among the European states forever. In other words, “this decision was regarded as punishment which deprived the State of civil rights forever.”⁶⁸⁴

An article, taken from the French press and published in *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, wrote that on the point of implementation of the Conference resolutions would be encountered with some difficulties. The newspaper, which alleged that the decisions put more responsibility on the Allies, said that this situation arised from leaving of all Western and Eastern Thrace to Greece, on the request of Britain. Thus, the problem of Thrace was joined the problem of İzmir problem. The article put forward the following view at this point:

Under these circumstances, how will the Allies be able to provide the compliance of their own decisions? It should be remembered that the British troops were recently defeated by Turkish Nationalists around İzmit, and they took Adapazarı

sovereignty of the State. Turkish people are not free even in İstanbul, their own home. The Sea of Marmara and Çanakkale will be under the control of the Straits Commision.” See İnan, *Ibid.*, p. 70.

⁶⁸⁴ *Vakit*, No.912, 8 Haziran 1336 [08.06.1920], p. 1.

and Bandırma from rebellious. Who will undertake to defeat Turkish Nationalists in Ankara and Sivas?⁶⁸⁵

According to *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, it is very hard to put the provisions of the Sevres Treaty into action because the Allies did not have enough power to enforce the treaty.

An article, taken from the British press and published in *Peyam-ı Sabah*, argued that there was a dispute between Mustafa Kemal and his friends and therefore unity and cooperation could not be mentioned among them. The article put emphasis on that despite the military power in Anatolia, the Allied powers could hardly use it to fulfill what they wanted. Moreover, it was said that allowing the Ottoman Sultan and his government to remain in İstanbul could alleviate the reaction that would arise in the Islamic world.⁶⁸⁶

Again, some British newspapers also stated that the most important issue regarding the enforcing of peace conditions would stem from giving İzmir to Greeks, and that this would be the reason for the constant resentment of the Turks. On the contrary, it was supposed that the separation of Thrace from Turkey would not be as effective on the Turkish people as İzmir problem, and it would gradually be forgotten over time.⁶⁸⁷

In other news from the Italian press about the decisions of San Remo, it was not welcomed that the Allied powers would permit the Greeks to spread over the interior of the Western Anatolia towards the end of June, in order to ensure peace! The article reminded that statesman, who drafted and ratified the Conference's decisions, had to take into consideration that making peace with the Damat Ferid and his supporters, and fighting with Mustafa Kemal Pasha at the same time were very difficult work. In fact, this practice was described as a devastating and crazy politics whose proficiency and utility were not easily understood.⁶⁸⁸

⁶⁸⁵ *Hâkimiyet-i Milliye*, No.32, 24 Mayıs 1336 [24.05.1920], 1. From *Le Temps*.

⁶⁸⁶ *Peyam-ı Sabah*, No.161, 10 Haziran 1336 [10.06.1920], p. 1. From *Times*.

⁶⁸⁷ *İkdam*, No.8404, 1 Ağustos 1336 [01.08.1920], p. 1. From *Morning Post*.

⁶⁸⁸ *Hâkimiyet-i Milliye*, No.54, 9 Ağustos 1336 [09.08.1920], p. 1. From *Il Secolo*. In the days after the Greek general attack, Venizelos made a statement to the French press that he argued that the Turks hesitated to comply with the Treaty, which prepared by the Allied powers and suitable with the

Finally, it is necessary to mention news published in *Açıksöz* about the peace conditions of San Remo. The news dated as August 16, 1920, referred to the Western states' policy in the East as follow:

European governments have two cruel and brutal bombs, called imperialism and capitalism, and they use them for the subordination of all nations except for them. It is being prepared to implement against Turkey. The main purpose of the First World War is the disintegration of Turkey. The main reason for the fighting is the exploitation of Egypt, Iraq, Elcezire, Syria, Thrace and finally Anatolia.⁶⁸⁹

The newspaper tried to attract the attention of the Turkish people that the Sevres Treaty was main part of the puposes of the First World War. In other words, the Allies wanted to actualize their plans on Anatolia with the help of the Sevres Treaty. It is understood that Sevres was only a tool that served the afterwards purposes of the Allied powers.

Moreover, the newspaper, which stressed that it was wanted that Turkey cut off its vital arteries and its independence was being violated with the Sevres Peace Treaty, also suggested the following views for occupations and imperialist plans:

The Sultan is a prisoner, the Government is a puppet, and a toy... is it that alone? The imperialists surround the Turks, constrained in Anatolia, with Armenia in order to cut off their ties and contacts with Turks from the East (Asia) and with co-religionists from the South. They equipped the Greeks with weapons from the West and closing off the vent of sea... They say to us live and develop under these circumstances. No... We will never accept this clear death sentence... the time when your dominance and oppression will end is very close...⁶⁹⁰

The paper insistently repeated that although the Allied powers and their tools; or Greeks and Armenians, had surrounded the Turks from all sides, the Turkish people did not accept their dominance and they would not be enslaved.

As the final words, it has been discussed what decisions were taken in San Remo and how these decisions were met in the press of Anatolia and İstanbul. It can be claimed that the Allied powers prepared Sevres Treaty, which envisaged partition of Turkish homeland by establishing independent Armenia in the Eastern Anatolia and Kurdistan in the Southeastern Anatolia, in order to realize their secret projects on

principle of equality. For this reason, Venizelos said that the Greek army was assigned with the task of clearing Turkish gangs. *Alemdar*, No.556-2856, July 3, 1920, p. 1. From *Le Figaro*.

⁶⁸⁹ *Açıksöz*, No.72, 16 Ağustos 1336 [16.08 1920], p. 1.

⁶⁹⁰ *Açıksöz*, No.70, 16 Ağustos 1336 [16.08 1920], p. 1.

Anatolia and the Middle East. After the conditions of the treaty had reached İstanbul, the whole Turkish people as well as the press were disappointed. They did not expect such a heavy provisions because they thought that the Turkish army had not been defeated and the country had even signed the Armistice under equal circumstances.

Both nationalist and anti-nationalist newspapers considered the conditions of the Sevres Treaty as a “punishment” for the Turkish people and the country. Besides, they asserted that the nation and homeland did not really deserve such a punishment and humiliation. However, the anti- nationalist newspapers like *Alemdar* and *Peyam-ı Sabah*, considering the Nationalists equal with the unionists, accused the Nationalists of causing such a heavy treaty. They wrote that if the Nationalists had not resisted and not caused to turmoil in Anatolia, the Allies would not design a heavy treaty like Sevres Treaty. That is, the actions of the Nationalists prepared the ground for being exposed very severe conditions. The nationalist papers rejected the claim mentioned above and they thought the biggest mistake of the state was to trust the justice of the Allies. Also, these papers argued that the Turkish people did not accept the Sevres Treaty, called as “death warrant” of Turkey. Additionally, the Allies would need extra forces to enforce this treaty that challenged with the notions of independent state.

4.1.3. Signing of The Sevres Treaty and Reaction of The Ankara Government

The text of peace terms could only ve reacged to İstanbul seventeen days later. Although the Ottoman delegate requested the extra time to sign the treaty until on June 11, 1920, the Allied leaders granted fifteen-day duration to the delegation. Grand Vizier Damad Ferid personally went to Paris on June 12, 1920, to seek amendment for the Sevres Treaty. On July 5, the Allied Prime Ministers, convened in Spa, town in Belgium, to investigate the provisions of the Versailles Treaty signed with Germans. They also discussed in Spa the demands of the Ottoman delegation for modification peace terms. The Supreme Council, hopeful of the successful Greek invasion that began on June 22, 1920, rejected the request of the delegation on July 11, 1920. They gave a memorandum to the Ottoman delegation and newspapers

published it. The Allies briefly dwelled on that the Ottoman Empire had caused to the extension of the War, and thus caused to disappear millions of people and wealth. They extended the duration until July 27, 1920, to be signed the Peace Treaty.⁶⁹¹ The Allies insisted that the Ottoman Government had to sign as soon as possible, and that the Ottoman delegates did not have the luxury to demand modification on the conditions.⁶⁹²

The Damat Ferid Pasha cabinet found it useful to discuss the issue in the special council. For this purpose, on July 22, 1920, at the Yıldız Palace, “the Sultanate Council” gathered at the request of Sultan Vahdettin, and the peace conditions were negotiated. Before the voting for the treaty, the Sultan had left the council. With the approval of all members except for Ferik Rıza Pasha, the Council of Sultanate, who preferred to maintain as a weak state rather than to disappear completely, decided to accept the Sevres Treaty on July 22, 1920. In that regard, the influence of the Greek invasion, started on June 22, in Anatolia and Thrace also played major role in taking this decision.⁶⁹³ Damat Ferid Pasha immediately informed the British High Commissioner De Robeck that the delegation would leave for Sevres to sign the treaty. Also, he explained that the delegation was consisted of Hadi Pasha, Rıza Tevfik and Ambassador of Bern Reşat Halis, who were also members of Assembly of Notables and participated in the Council of the Sultanate.⁶⁹⁴

Finally, the Ottoman delegates signed the Treaty of Sevres, consisted of four hundred thirty three provisions embarrassing for the country, on August 10, 1920, in the city

⁶⁹¹ Açıksöz, No.69, 12 Ağustos 1336 [12.08.1920], p. 4; *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, No.55, 13 Ağustos 1336 [13.08.1920], p. 2. For detailed information, See Ulubelen, *Ibid.*, p. 225; Kurat, *Ibid.*, p. 58; Özkaya... [et al.]; *Milli Mücadele Tarihi...*, Vol. I, p. 284.

⁶⁹² For the Allies, Turkey was not a party but a booty and it was enough to dictate to the Government of the Sultan how and what is wanted. As for the “National Movement” under the leadership of Mustafa Kemal... “It was only a headache for the Great Powers.” But some of them were aware of what was happening: “if we do not finish our fighting for partition, we will not find a Turkish Government... Or even worse, we will find a Turkish Government that we can not cope with...” They noticed that they had no too much time to spend. See Yalçın...[et al.]; *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 209.

⁶⁹³ Yalçın...[et al.]; *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 209. For the list of members of the Sultanate Council, See Bilsel, *Ibid.*, p. 344.

⁶⁹⁴ Kurat, *Ibid.*, p. 58; Türkgeldi, *Mondros ve Mudanya Mütarekelerinin Tarihi*, pp. 128-130; Bilsel, *Ibid.*, p. 345; Goloğlu, *Üçüncü Meşrutiyet*, pp. 242-243.

of Sevres, near Paris.⁶⁹⁵ The Treaty of Sevres was an integral part of the system of Versailles Peace Treaties, which was imposed on the countries that defeated the First World War in 1914-1918. With this treaty, the Allied powers divided the Ottoman Empire and shared it among them. Not satisfied with this, they also took the remaining so-called independent Ottoman State under their absolute economic, legal and financial administration. In this sense, the Treaty of Sevres was one of the severest peace treaties recently adopted as a punishment for a nation and this “Treaty was to be disintegrated Turkey alive” just as Lenin said.⁶⁹⁶ Moreover, according to the terms of the Sevres Treaty, Turkey was virtually deprived of its right to be an independent state. For Allies, there is nothing to be sad in the wiping off Turkey.⁶⁹⁷

The reaction of the GNA to the Treaty of Sevres was very harsh, and the Commander of the Eastern Front, Kazım Karabekir Pasha sent a telegram to Ankara on August 17, 1920, asking that everyone signing the Sevres Treaty had to be declared as traitor. For this reason, the Assembly, which did not recognize this Treaty, accepted that all Ottoman statesmen who had ratified the Sevres deprived of citizenship rights on August 19, 1920, by declaring them as “traitor”. The Assembly also decided that these people should be cursed everywhere.⁶⁹⁸ Now, the resistance of Anatolia against İstanbul was taking its final form and Ankara declared that the İstanbul Government was an illegitimate authority which handed over the destiny of its own people and homeland to the Allies.

The Treaty of Sevres, signed on August 10, 1920, was delayed long time to be approved by an authority, representing the Turkish people. According to the Ottoman Constitution, the applicability of the Treaty of Sevres depended on the ratification of it by parliaments. However, the Ottoman Parliament had been repealed on April 11,

⁶⁹⁵ A. M. Şamsutdinov, *Mondros'tan Lozan'a Türkiye Ulusal Kurtuluş Savaşı Tarihi (1918-1923)*, Trans. By Ataoğlan Behramoğlu, (İstanbul: Doğan Kitapçılık, 1999), p. 239; Mango, *From the Sultan to Atatürk*, p. 98. American historian Frank H. Simond, who had written the post war history of Europe, commented on the Sevres Treaty like that: “Turkey had been an ally of Germany and a true death sentence was given against the Turkish Empire in Paris...” See Bilsel, *Ibid.*, p. 345.

⁶⁹⁶ Şamsutdinov, *Ibid.*, p. 239; Goloğlu, *Üçüncü Meşrutiyet*, p. 246.

⁶⁹⁷ Şamsutdinov, *Ibid.*, p. 239. Lord Kinross commented on the Treaty of Sevres as follows: “The Treaty of Sevres was an early product of that ‘cicis’ of Allied conferences which, with continuous rounds of entertainment, followed the signature of the Treaty of Versailles.” See Kinross, *Ibid.*, p. 231.

⁶⁹⁸ Goloğlu, *Üçüncü Meşrutiyet*, p. 247; Selek, *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 361; Şamsutdinov, *Ibid.*, p. 243.

1920.⁶⁹⁹ The GNA made its decisions against the Sevres from the very beginning of the process. In that time, among the Western states, there was no one to approve of the Treaty of Sevres except for Greece. Thus, the Sevres had not been legally validated and had not been put into force. After the National Struggle, the Lausanne Treaty, signed after the victory of the National Struggle, would make certain the invalidation of the Sevres Treaty.⁷⁰⁰

As mentioned before, the “devastation policy” of the Government of Ferid Pasha, which carried out against the Nationalists and even against the Turkish nation, was removed on October 17, 1920, after withdrawing from the power. Now, the direction of the War of National Independence would turn into a Turkish-Greek battle. Winning this historic struggle would take place with the determination of the devoted Turkish nation and Commander-in-Chief Mustafa Kemal Pasha.

Although the İstanbul Government had signed the Treaty of Sevres on August 10, 1920, since the beginning of May 1920, the press had debated whether the signing of the Ottoman representatives would carry a value, or not. In the article published in *İzmir’e Doğru* criticized the decisions of San Remo and meticulously emphasized that there was no positive aspect of the decisions, and that it was impossible for the Turks to accept these decisions, which did not comply with the integrity and indivisibility of Anatolia. *İzmir’e Doğru* wanted the Allied powers to understand precisely that “Anatolia considered the Damat Ferid Pasha cabinet as an illegitimate and treacherous government.” In addition, the article clearly expressed that “Anatolia was under the rule and domination of the GNA, and that Ankara was the only decision-making body for Turks, not the pro-Britain İstanbul.” The newspaper wrote about the attempt of the İstanbul Government to sign the Sevres Treaty: “A government that is not based on the National Forces can not make any peace treaty. *Le Temps*, one of the most important and influential newspapers in Europe, constantly announced and proved this truth.”⁷⁰¹

⁶⁹⁹ Jaeschke, *İngiliz Belgeleri*, p. 156.

⁷⁰⁰ Yalçın...[et al.]; *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 212.

⁷⁰¹ *İzmir’e Doğru*, No.59, 5 Mayıs 1336 [05.05.1920], p. 1. An example of the news that *İzmir’e Doğru* mentioned: In a report in the French press, it was debated who was the authority to sign the Sevres Treaty. The following question put in a lead article of *Le Temps* published in Paris on June 17, 1920, is interesting: “A Turkish Peace has been prepared, but who is going to sign it? What is the use of this

Another nationalist newspaper in Anatolia, *Öğüt* published news commenting on the signing of the Sevres Treaty. The newspaper insisted that “the Turkish nation would never approve “this death sentence”, which the Damat Ferid Pasha cabinet or any delegation would be forced to sign with pressure. The newspaper underlined that those who would sign the peace treaty did not represent the nation; accordingly, there was no opportunity to enforce treaty.”⁷⁰²

The other news that questioned the authority of the İstanbul Government concerning with signing of the Sevres Treaty was published in *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*. According to the article taken from the French press, it was argued that there was doubt about the possibility of implementing the peace conditions determined in the Conferences of London and San Remo. Also, it was also noteworthy that the regions given to Greece and Italy seemed to be contradictory to the previous domain of France in the East. Therefore, the newspaper claimed that “the İstanbul Government clearly cooperated with the British and it was doubtful whether Damat Ferid was free or not. In addition, the article admits that the İstanbul Government was only an imaginary force, and that it could not stop the battle in Cilicia and consequently did not have the authority to sign peace in Paris.”⁷⁰³

A report from the British press argued that the acceptance of peace conditions should be interpreted for Damat Ferid Pasha as a victory against the Nationalists. For the reaction of the Islamic world regarding the peace treaty, the newspaper referred the following remarks:

... It should be told the Islamic world that despite the rightful punishment of the Ottoman Empire, Britain has never abandoned its traditional politics of respect and adherence to Islamic societies. Also, it should be expressed that the Britain has never initiated a crusade against religion, traditions and institutions of Islam. The

sign by Damat Ferid, who bears the title of Prime Minister, but lacks an army and executive authority? Are we going to sign a treaty?” *Le Temps*, June 17, 1920. “Bir Türk Sulh Antlaşması hazırlandı. Fakat bunu imzalayacak olan kimlerdir? Ordusu, hükümet otoritesi bulunmayan, Sadrazam ünvanını taşıyan Damat Ferid’e kalem vermekle ne elde edilecektir? Varlığı olmayan bir hükümetle hiç uygulanmayacak bir anlaşma mı yapılacaktır?” Quoted from İnan, *Ibid.*, p. 73.

⁷⁰² *Öğüt*, No.363, 19 Mayıs 1336 [19.05.1920], p. 1.

⁷⁰³ *Hâkimiyet-i Milliye*, No.34, 31 May 3ıs 1336 [31.08.1920,] p. 1. According to British reports, even Lloyd George acknowledged that the National movement strengthened and that the İstanbul Government had no authority to sign the treaty. According to him, “There was almost no meaning to negotiate with the Turkish delegate, who had come to Paris to sign the teraty.” See Ulubelen, *Ibid.*, p. 223.

events that are happening now are nothing more than indispensable and natural historical evolvment...⁷⁰⁴

The British press insistently emphasized that Britain respected for all kinds of institutions and traditions of Muslims and British policymakers did not fight against the Islam. These kinds of publications proved that the British authorities tried to avoid from the reaction of Muslim population in its dominions. The British authorities also intended to prevent the supports of Muslims to the national resistance in Anatolia.

The signing of the Treaty of Sevres by the İstanbul Government was met with great reaction in the press. In the article published in *Öğüt* emphasized that this treaty was considered by the people of Anatolia as a sentence of death, but no provision could be put into practice. The newspaper, which was trying to strengthen the spirituality of the people, wrote: “While reading these provisions, which are sharper than a dagger, let us be grieved but not be desperate. Astonish those who arranged this treaty, curse those who signed, and let us draw a lesson from this.”⁷⁰⁵

As *Öğüt* cursed, *Anadolu'da Yeni Gün* also condemned fiercely those who had signed the Sevres Treaty. On this point, *Anadolu'da Yeni Gün* published telegraphs, coming from various parts of Anatolia and protesting the signing of the treaty on September 5, 1920. A Telegram sent from Erzurum told the following statements:

Which authority does the İstanbul Government, which has never received even the least of trust from people of Erzurum, depend to sign the treaty? The governments of İstanbul and London, planning to confront Anatolia and especially the Eastern Anatolia Region with fait accompli, will never succeed.⁷⁰⁶

As it is understood from the news that the people around Erzurum thought that the İstanbul Government and London cooperated to annihilate the Turkish people and homeland. It also repeated that İstanbul was not a legitimate power and the nation did not trust the İstanbul Government.

⁷⁰⁴ *İkdam*, No.8412, 9 Ağustos 1336 [09.08.1920], p. 1. From *Daily Telegraph*.

⁷⁰⁵ *Öğüt*, No.455, 19 Ağustos 1336 [19.08.1920], p. 1.

⁷⁰⁶ “Kendilerinden (Erzurumlulardan) çok az bile olsa hiçbir zaman güven almamış olan İstanbul Hükümeti, hangi yetkiye dayanarak imzalama kudretini kendinde bulmuştur. Anadolu'yu özellikle Doğu Anadolu Bölgesi'ni bir oldubitti karşısında bırakmayı düşünen İstanbul ve Londra hükümetleri hiçbir zaman başarılı olamayacaklardır.” *Anadolu'da Yeni Gün*, No.402-22, 5 Eylül 1336 [05.09.1920], p. 1.

After the signing of the Sevres Treaty by the İstanbul Government, the press mainly focused on the issues of what strategies should be followed for the implementation of the agreement and how the Nationalists, regarded as the greatest obstacle to the implementation of the treaty, could be overcome. A report from the French press stated that Lloyd George's permission the Greeks to invade Anatolia was attributed to the pre-emptive act to neutralize the reactions of the Turks to the severe conditions of the Sevres Treaty. The newspaper also urged a change in the terms of the agreement for the realization of the peace, or else the war in Anatolia would continue and would lead to it spreading to the peoples of French colonies in Africa as an example. The news commented on what would be the attitude of the Islamic world in the face of the Sevres Treaty:

...The reason why the Turkish nation and the Islamic world did not recognize Damat Ferid is that he is an instrument of the Britain. According to reports from Delhi to London, if the modification in the treaty is not realized, a general strike will begin in August... On the other side, the independence movement of Indian soldiers forming the whole of the British army in Iran, Iraq, Thrace and Anatolia is expected with concern....⁷⁰⁷

The French press, which declared Damat Ferid as a tool in the hands of Britain, claimed that the Sevres Treaty would cause the uprisings of Muslims. In that way, French paper tried to attract the attention of the British authorities to great threat growing in their dominions. Moreover, French adopted that it was impossible to enforce Sevres with all provisions because they knew that Muslims in both French and British colonies would oppose to the partition of Turkish homeland.

In the news following the signing of the treaty, a French newspaper, *Journal des Debats*, supporting opposition party in France, published negative news about the Anatolian movement. According to the newspaper, the people of Anatolia were thinking: “How can a person claim to be a good Muslim if he revolts against the Sultan?” Moreover, since the “extremists” in Ankara understand that the situation is not defensible, they tried to invite the Bolshevik invasion in order to put Europe under difficult conditions. In addition, the newspaper advocated the following opinion:

⁷⁰⁷ *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, No.60, 2 Eylül 1336 [02.09.1920], p. 4. From *Radikal*.

A general dissatisfaction in Anatolia was prevailed and the Nationalists are not really anything but a toy in the hands of the administrators in Moscow. In the face of these adverse conditions, it is enough for the İstanbul government to make a small sacrifice in order to reconsider the Anatolian people who are loyal to the Sultan.⁷⁰⁸

The French newspaper explicitly argued that the Nationalists also revolted against the Sultan and it encouraged innocent Anatolian people to set against the Nationalists. The newspaper recommended Damat Ferid cabinet to dissuade the the Anatolian pepole from giving support the National movement. In this way, Damat Ferid would easily suppress the Anatolian movement by claiming that the Nationalists were not obeyed the Sultan-Caliph. This also meant that the National movement was not legitimate action.

The British newspaper *Bosphore* published in İstanbul dweled on what was to be done after signing the Sevres Treaty: “It is necessary to appease Anatolia. It is required that all the forces and authorities had to be left the Central Government. It is necessary to ensure that the Sultan is respected throughout the country and that the national unity is established in the country.” The newspaper, knowing that Ahmet İzzet Pasha wanted to reconcile with Ankara said that this policy was not successful and it could not succeed after that. According to *Bosphore*, making deal with Mustafa Kemal means:

...to wipe out the traces of the murder that he has done with a sponge, to forgive the terrible killings that he has carried out the last few months and to thrust out a hand to a bandit... Thus, the Unionism will come to power again with full dignity, will start again the intrigue of “Berlin” with the inexhaustible love and fire the gunpowder....⁷⁰⁹

As it is seen that the British newspaper considered that the ratification of Sevres by Ankara was unnecessary action. According to newspaper, opposing to the negotiation with the Nationalists, asserted that this negotiation would be victory of the Nationalists and all British attempts would be invalidated.

During the seeking way of reconciliation with the Ankara Government, an article published in *Peyam Sabah* by taking from the French newspaper *Orient News*, suggested that the Treaty of Sevres was a chance for the Turks. According to the

⁷⁰⁸ *İkdam*, , No.8464, 30 Eylül 1336 [30.09.1920], p. 1. From *Journal des Debats*.

⁷⁰⁹ *İkdam*, , No.8461, 27 Eylül 1336 [27.09.1920], p. 1. From *Bosphore*.

newspaper, “the Sevres Treaty had given the Turks the most distinguished opportunity that history has dated ever.” It was written that whether or not to use this opportunity was depended on the decision of Mustafa Kemal and his friends. In this regard, the newspaper said:

The Treaty of Allies constitutes a chance for the Turks. It is up to them to take advantage of it. Indeed, with the Sevres Treaty, the Turks - under the circumstances not yet implemented - have been granted the possession of the most beautiful capital of the world. However, the Turks had abused the status of İstanbul in the past that it is necessary to take it completely from their hands as a punishment... In addition, there are such Turks - and they constitute a large part - are rebellious against the Central Government. Now, it is up to them to decide whether or not Turkey will take advantage of the great opportunity. All the future of Turkey depends only on the stance of Mustafa Kemal and his friends... But, Kemalists are threatening Turkey with an ominous decision they will give. Mustafa Kemal and his movement will be responsible for the loss of the great opportunity given to his country... It should be well known that there will be a casualty to the country that he supposed to serve with his rebellion and it will lead to loose his life.⁷¹⁰

The newspaper, which emphasized that the fate of Turkey depended on the decision of Mustafa Kemal and his friends, admitted that signature of the İstanbul Government for the Sevres Treaty had no value in the eyes of Allies and Turkish people. Moreover, the news confessed that the real representative of the nation was the GNA, and the real legitimate authority that could act in the name of the nation was the Ankara Government.

To sum up, it can be inferred from the news that signing of Sevres Treaty by İstanbul Government did not have any diplomatic value because the Turkish people did not trust it. Therefore, the Allied powers sought the way to negotiate with Ankara Government as a legitimate representative of the Turkish nation. As the press continuously expressed, the Allies knew that the Sevres Treaty would not be enforced and it would leave an invalid treaty without the ratification of Ankara Government.

⁷¹⁰ *Peyam-ı Sabah*, No.307, 3 Teşrin-i Sani 1336 [03.11.1920], p. 1. From *Orient News*.

4.1.4. Diplomatic Relations With Soviet Russia and the Monetary and Military Aids

The National Struggle constituted an interesting period with respect to the relations between Turkey and Soviet Russia. The Russians at first sight had a positive reaction to the Turkish War of Independence. They interpreted the new movement led by Mustafa Kemal Pasha in Anatolia as a similar of their own movements and spreading to the Islamic world.⁷¹¹ Moreover, the establishment of friendship between Turkey and Soviet Russia had a historical significance in terms of the anti-imperialist fight of the Turkish people. The leaders of the Turkish liberation movement, which was trapped by hostile circles of the Allied powers and their allies, set their sights on Soviet Russia since the earliest days of the National Struggle.⁷¹²

The first contacts of the Nationalists with Soviet Russia were established in Havza. Mustafa Kemal Pasha, who stayed in the Havza for 22 days, held meeting with a Russian delegation headed by Colonel Budiyeni. Budiyeni said that the Bolshevik Russia would grant weapons, ammunition and money for the Nationalists and help the Turks against the common enemy the Allied powers. Furthermore, Budiyeni tried to attract the attention of Mustafa Kemal that the Allies planned to establish independent Armenia, Kurdistan, and Pontus state in the shores of Black Sea. However, he emphasized it Soviet Russia was ready to fight against the Allies together with Turkey.⁷¹³

Mustafa Kemal noticed that the Russians wanted to spread and establish their communist ideology and administration system in Anatolia, on the pretext of helping the Nationalists. In the negotiations in Havza, Budiyeni, in response to all these aid, stipulated conditions that the new government which would be established in Anatolia should have abolished the Sultanate and the Caliphate, and adopted Communism. Budiyeni wanted to make promises in advance, but Mustafa Kemal argued that it needed time for all of these to realize and that the primary goal of the

⁷¹¹ Yalçın...[et al.]; *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 224.

⁷¹² Şamsutdinov, *Ibid.*, p. 187.

⁷¹³ Ertürk, *Ibid.*, pp. 338-340.

National Forces was to save the country from invasion.⁷¹⁴ In this way, Mustafa Kemal neither accepted the demands of Soviet delegation, nor rejected their proposals.

Around the days of even before the assembly of the Sivas Congress, some Turkish patriots discussed the issue of sending a representative to Russia with the intent of the Soviet support for Turkey's struggle. Ali Fuat Pasha (Cebesoy) had written the following on this subject: “At that time, while the new regime was established in Russia, we thought very much about making our nation friends and fellow together by removing the seeds of the Turkish-Russian hostility that the Tsars had cultivated.”⁷¹⁵

The Britain had occupied İstanbul on March 16, 1920, and distributed the Ottoman Parliament. In addition, they had arrested many members of parliament and sent them to exile in Malta. These kinds of aggressive attitudes and policies of the Allied powers towards the Nationalists had led Mustafa Kemal to follow the friendship policy towards Soviet Russia. In addition, the Ankara Government required military and economic aids and this would come only from the East.⁷¹⁶ For this reason, following days of the Sivas Congress, Mustafa Kemal Pasha sent an unofficial representative to Soviet Russia with the purpose of obtaining financial and military support. Halil Pasha (Kut) was the first person sent directly so as to establish contact with Bolshevik authorities in the fall of 1919. Mustafa Kemal gave him some instructions as follows:

We would like to benefit from your services in the East. For example, for opening up a transit route between us and the Bolsheviks, and thus establishing contact, also for securing arms, ammunition and financial aid from them... Any aid you can give Anatolia from those quarters will be much more valuable than any other kind of help you could offer.⁷¹⁷

⁷¹⁴ Ertürk, *Ibid.*, pp. 341-342.

⁷¹⁵ Cebesoy, *Moskova Hatıraları*, p. 121.

⁷¹⁶ Sonyel, *Türk Kurtuluş Savaşı ve...* Vol. I, pp. 172-174.

⁷¹⁷ Cebesoy, *Moskova Hatıraları*, p. 134; Tansel, *Ibid.*, Vol. III, pp. 235-236. The Turkish official appointed by Mustafa Kemal to contact Soviet Russia was arrested by the White Army and remained in his hands for a while. Mc Kinder, a fully authorized British representative in the General Staff of Denikin, confirmed this detention certainly, in spite of being denied by Turkish authors. See Şamsutdinov, *Ibid.*, p. 187.

Halil Pasha, who set off in October 1919, was able to arrive in Moscow in the spring of 1920. He described the heavy situation that Turkey fell into after the invasions of Allies and he reported that “a National Government would be set up soon in Anatolia, and it would be ready to sign a peace and friendship treaty with the Government of the Soviet Russia.” In this regard, after April 1920, Turkish-Soviet relations began to concentrate on the Moscow-Ankara line and take on more of a diplomatic character. Just after the opening of the National Assembly, on April 26, 1920, Mustafa Kemal accepted a set of proposals as the basis of preliminary negotiations with the Bolsheviks. As amended by Mustafa Kemal Pasha, these proposals accepted in principle Turkish-Bolshevik cooperation against imperialist governments, as well as mutual coordination of political and military operations in Caucasia, and requested Soviet material aid.⁷¹⁸ Following Mustafa Kemal Pasha’s approval, the proposals were sent by Kazım Karabekir Pasha to Moscow and handed to Halil Pasha there. The first proposals of the Ankara Government to the Soviet Government were considered by Moscow as the first official communication from the Ankara Government and it started an exchange of communications between Ankara and Moscow. In addition, Mustafa Kemal in his letter also explained the policy of the Ankara Government based on the National Pact. The Soviet Government, which replied to the letter of Mustafa Kemal on June 3, 1920, but the letter was reached to Ankara on June 15, 1920. The Anatolian newspapers also shared the letter in their columns. Chicherin stated to recognize officially the Government of Ankara and informed that it would support the struggle of Ankara against the imperialist states. Emphasizing “depending on the supreme ideal of the liberation of the oppressed peoples”, Chicherin continued statements as follows:

The Soviet Government is always extending friendship to all the peoples of the world, by depending on the principle of self-determination of every nation. The Soviets follows the heroic battles conducted by the Turkish people for independence and territorial integrity with a lively interest and is eager to lay the foundations of solid friendship that needs to merge Turkish and Russian peoples in the heavy days for Turkey.⁷¹⁹

⁷¹⁸ Kamuran Gürün, *Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri (1920-1953)*, (Ankara: TTK, 2010), pp. 33-34; Tansel, *Ibid.*, Vol. III, pp. 236-237.

⁷¹⁹ *Hâkimiyet-i Milliye*, No.44, 8 Temmuz 1337 [08.07.1921], p. 1; *Açıksöz*, No.61, 12 Temmuz 1337 [12.07.1921], p. 1. For detailed information See Semyon İ. Aralov, *Bir Sovyet Diplomatının Türkiye*

With the help of corresponding, the first official diplomatic contact was created between the governments of Ankara and Moscow.

However, there was no exact the Turkish-Soviet alliance. One of the reasons for hesitations of the Soviets making alliance was the negative attitude about helping the non-Communist states due to the British reaction. As it is known, at that time the Soviets tried to make a Trade Agreement with Britain. Another reason, Soviet Russia was not sure that whether Mustafa Kemal would succeed in his struggle, or not.⁷²⁰ At that time, Soviet Russia was the only country in the world to recognize the Government of GNA and to establish friendly diplomatic relations with it. The imperialist states of Western Europe were completely in an effort to overthrow the Turkish Government and to dismember Turkey. In addition to these, the negotiations for the Sevres Treaty began between the Allies and the İstanbul Government. The Ankara Government needed the support of the Soviet Russia to resist against the impositions of the Sevres Treaty and to ensure the independence of the country by opposing occupations. Under these circumstances, Mustafa Kemal Pasha sent a telegraph to Kazım Karabekir Pasha, saying that the National Government had to establish actual relations with the Bolsheviks as soon as possible.⁷²¹

After the first contacts starting in the spring of 1920, the Ankara Government negotiated with Soviet Russia and agreed with it in principle for monetary, military and technical material supports. For this reason, a delegation headed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Bekir Sami Bey (Kunduh), and the Minister of Economy, Yusuf Kemal Bey (Tengirşenk), Deputy of Lazistan Osman Bey, consultant Doctor İbrahim Tali Bey (Öngören) and Colonel Seyfi Bey (Düzgören) had left Ankara for Moscow on May 11, 1920, and the Turkish delegation could arrive in Moscow on July 19, 1920.⁷²² Bekir Sami Bey presented the good feelings of the Turkish people and the GNA to Lenin. He narrated the following feelings:

Anıları (1922-1923), Trans. By Hasan Ali Ediz, (İstanbul: TİBKY, 2010), pp. 7-8; Tansel, *Ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 237; Karabekir, *İstiklal Harbimiz*, Vol. IV, pp. 1661-1662.

⁷²⁰ Sonyel, *Türk Kurtuluş Savaşı ve...*, p. 179; Cebesoy, *Moskova Hatıraları*, pp. 138-139.

⁷²¹ Sonyel, *Türk Kurtuluş Savaşı ve...*, p. 179; Şamsutdinov, *Ibid.*, p. 189; Yalçın...[et al.]; *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 225.

⁷²² Gürün, *Ibid.*, p. 35; Tansel, *Ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 237.

Ankara was loyal to the principles that the Soviets had proclaimed to the whole world. Soviets should not refrain to support and friendship to Turkish people, which had constantly struggled against the imperialist and capitalist governments for two years, and pursued the goal of their existence and independence within their national borders, and did not have intention to invade the neighboring countries.⁷²³

Despite the fact that the conditions of the friendship treaty were ready, relations became strained because Soviet Russia wanted the Ankara Government to give up Kars, Ardahan and Batum and demanded Ankara to leave Bitlis, Van and Muş to Armenians. During this period, the Soviets had an advantage over the White Army, defended the rule of Tsar, and began to defeat Poland. In addition to these, Soviets tried to establish commercial relations with the Britain. They considered that reaching a commercial and economic agreement with the Britain was the most profitable way in that time. For this reason, they dragged their feet to help the Nationalists urgently.⁷²⁴ However, despite all disagreements, in the end the Russians understood the importance of assistance fighting in Turkey against imperialism and they sent great money, valuing 100.000 gold liras via Halil Pasha, who had gone to Russia. Halil Pasha left Moscow in July 1920, and arrived in Nahcivan in great difficulty because there was no road connection between Anatolia and Soviet Russia at that time. Halil Pasha, who came from Nahcivan to Karaköse, submitted the golds to the Commander of the Division General Cavit Bey (Erdelhun). Cavit Bey sent the gold to Erzurum by train on September 8, 1920. A portion of the gold was left in Erzurum for the expenses of the Eastern Front, and the rest of it was sent to Ankara.⁷²⁵

In the meantime, the first weapons and ammunition aid arrived at the port of Trabzon at the end of September 1920. The amount of incoming equipment consisted of 3,387 rifles, 3,623 crate ammunition and 3,000 bayonets. Since the rifles were weapons captured from the Germans during the First World War, the Nationalists requested in

⁷²³ Şamsutdinov, *Ibid.*, pp. 190-191; Cebesoy, *Moskova Hatıraları*, p. 72.

⁷²⁴ Mithat Atabay, *Milli Mücadele Tarihi*, (İstanbul: Kriter Yayınları, 2010), p. 203; Gürün, *Ibid.*, p. 37; Tansel, *Ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 239.

⁷²⁵ Atabay, *Milli Mücadele Tarihi*, pp. 203-204; Tansel, *Ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 236.

large quantities from their bullets. Furthermore, Yusuf Kemal Bey, in Moscow, brought one million gold rubles more while he returned to Turkey in October.⁷²⁶

Soviet Russia commissioned Budu Medivani (brother of the Georgian ambassador of Ankara) to Ankara as an ambassador in October 1920, while the political debates and correspondences between Bekir Sami Bey and Foreign Minister of the Soviet Government Chicherin continued. In return, the Ankara Government appointed Ali Fuat Pasha as ambassador to Moscow on December 14, 1920.⁷²⁷

The unofficial relations between the Nationalists with Soviet Russia had started in Havza at very beginning of the National Struggle. However, there was no official diplomatic connection between Ankara and Moscow until June 1920. As a matter of fact, the Nationalists were in need of military and monetary supports to continue its legitimate struggle. Therefore, Mustafa Kemal Pasha assigned Halil Pasha to establish relations with Soviets and asked aid from them. After this attempt, Mustafa Kemal and Chicherin began diplomatic correspondences. Since then, Moscow and Ankara kept in touch. On this point, Moscow assigned Budu Medivani as ambassador of Ankara on October 1920. In response to this attempt, Ankara sent Ali Fuat Pasha as ambassador to Russia on December 14, 1920. During this period, Soviet Russia was fighting both White Army inside and Poland outside. However, Soviets even gave support to the Nationalists, fighting common enemy; or imperialists. It is certain that the Nationalists were able to overcome many obstacles in the course of the National Struggle with the help of military and monetary aids of Soviet Russia.

⁷²⁶ Atabay, *Milli Mücadele Tarihi*, pp. 202-203.

⁷²⁷ Gürün, *Ibid.*, p. 63; Atabay, *Milli Mücadele Tarihi*, pp. 214-215.

4.2. Military Successes of the Ankara Government and Consolidation of The Authority

4.2.1. The National Forces in the Press

From September of 1919 until the middle of 1920, the news in the press was mostly concentrated on the National Forces. The vast majority of the news had tendency to promote the National movement; which had started with the Amasya Circular, improved with the Erzurum and Sivas Congress, and lastly recognized by the İstanbul Government through the Amasya Protocol. However, there was some news that took negative attitude towards the movement as it can be seen later.

Firstly, on November, 17, 1919, *İleri* published a statement of the Grand Rabbi, Haim Naum Efendi. Naum Efendi stated in an interview with the French press that “the National movement was not directed against the Allies and that the National movement managed by Mustafa Kemal Pasha was a truth. All Turkish people of Anatolia were with him.” He continued that “there was a strong army, which was made up of remaining members of the old army and volunteers. But the ammunition was scarce and there was no possibility to bring it...” When asked whether this movement was dangerous to the Allied Powers, and especially to France, which had a mandate over the vast majority of Syria, Cilicia and Turkish provinces, he replied:

I have a very pure opinion, No! Here are the reasons: The National Movement gained semi-official character. Mustafa Kemal was a rebel in the time of Damat Ferid's Government, but today he is almost an assistant of the Cabinet managed by Ali Rıza Pasha. Mustafa Kemal Pasha is neither adventurous nor a fanatic. He fully understands the international situation of Turkey. He is loyal to the sovereign. He does not avoid obeying. His program - that is the program of the whole Turkey - is very simple: his objective is to apply Wilson's principles completely; that is, Turkish regions should remain Turkish. It does not go any further... You, the French, can have an effect of savior on them. I say as a friend, it depends on you whether Turkey is worried about you, or not.⁷²⁸

The Grand Rabbi Naum Efendi knew that the Anatolian Resistance was a fact whether the Allies accept it or not. He also implied that the National movement was a legitimate action which aimed to realize the independence and integrity of the

⁷²⁸ *İleri*, No.667, 17 Teşrin-i Sani 1336 [17.11.1919], p. 1. From *Le Matin*.

country depending on Wilson's Principles. This interview also shows the attitude of all Jewish citizens towards the National movement. The Jews continued their moderate and positive attitude during the Armistice and the National Struggle.

The press in that time generally argued that the Turkish Nationalists had interdependency for their justified action. For instance, in the news in *İkdam*, which had been taken from a French newspaper, it was explained as follows:

The Anatolian movement was in fact stemmed from a tendency of thought that Turks aimed to protect their natural rights and that this movement turned into a form of 'singli masses. The newspaper also brought forward that these desires of the Turks were inspired by the Wilson Principles.⁷²⁹

İkdam published this news as its editorial and supported totally the ideas of the French newspaper. Moreover, according to *İkdam*, no doubt, it was inevitable that the British and French administrators would grant the inherent right to live, deserving of every nation, to Turkish nation as well. The newspaper emphasized that this movement was recognized by European authors as a national manifestation.

Hakimiyet-i Milliye published an article taken from the French daily, *Le Figaro*. The paper made assertive and remarkable comments on position of the National Forces:

The National Forces became a political force. This political force has come in possession of the backbone of a strong government. With these features, if the Nationalists were disappeared, everything will become confused. Also, if the conditions for the future of Turkey are not provided in a short period of time, we will witness that "Turkish patriots cooperate with Russian Bolsheviks."⁷³⁰

According to the newspaper, the rapid development of Bolsheviks in Azerbaijan, and obtaining an active position over India and Egypt, make it imperative for Britain and France to conclude the Turkish peace as soon as possible. At this point, the newspaper believed that "the Turkish army and Turkish Nationalists could serve the Allied powers, which is creditor, for a great way of life (İslamic life) which will be established in Turkey. Can't this Islamic way of life become our ally against the Bolshevism which is enemy of both motherland and tradition?"⁷³¹

⁷²⁹ *İkdam*, No.8225, 4 Kanun-i Sani 1336 [04.01.1920], p. 1. From *Le Figaro*.

⁷³⁰ *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, No.4, 24 Kanun-i Sani 1336 [24.01.1920], p. 2. From *Le Temps*.

⁷³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 2. From *Le Temps*.

It can be understood from the news that the Allied powers were worried about possible cooperation between Soviet Russia and the Turkish Nationalists. The newspaper attracted the attention of the Allies that the National Forces were only political power which reach an agreement in Turkey; thus, it suggested that the Allies should conclude the peace treaty soon in order to obtain the Nationalists as an ally of western powers.

A report claiming that Turkey was in the possession of the Nationalists, the successors of the CUP, stated the following words for the National Forces: “There is no other organization in Turkey that has the power to administer the government. Those who had relied on those out of the Nationalists should understand this truth after gaining experience since a year.”⁷³² *İkdam* criticized the news of *Le Temps* in its issue dated as February 28, 1920. The newspaper mentioned that the nations needed serious and strong parties, and that the Western states had carried out their external relations based on strong internal organizations. In addition to these, *İkdam* emphasized that the necessary parties for the implementation of this policy in Turkey were not existed at present; however, the Nationalists substituted for these parties.⁷³³

Öğüt shared news from the British newspaper, *Near East* published in İstanbul. The newspaper emphasized that the Nationalists could not be ignored. The newspaper also recommended the people to accept the authority of the Nationalists. According to *Öğüt*, the Nationalists were described as follows:

...it is certainly not advisable method to cause a fit in order to establish dominance. ...It is a matter of doing positive work in Turkey. This is to accept the administration of the Nationalists as being free from all kinds of hatred and enmity...⁷³⁴

As the media organ of the National movement in Ankara, *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* published a report from the French press. The newspaper indicated that in Turkey, there was no force, which could take the place of the National Forces in the army, in the administration, in the formation of public opinion, and in the direction of the public. Due to the developments in the south, France was tortured with financial and

⁷³² *İkdam*, No.8279, 27 Şubat 1336 [27.02.1920], p. 1.

⁷³³ *İkdam*, No.8280, 28 Şubat 1336 [28.02.1920], p. 1.

⁷³⁴ *Öğüt*, January No.250, 29 Kanun-i Sani 1336 [29.01.1920], p. 1. From *Near East*.

emotional damage, and this was attributed to “not pursuing a strong politics, which is respectful of the legitimate case of the Turkish Nationalists and convenient to reach an agreement with them.”⁷³⁵

In addition to the positive news about the Nationalists, some negative ones also appeared in the press. For example, *Peyam* published a statement made by Damat Ferid to the French press. Damat Ferid commented the National movement as follows:

Movement of Mustafa Kemal is not depending on the nation. There is no military importance. Those were officers, promoted in the war (the First World War), who spread over in Anatolia and search for duty. They want to organize a movement. This movement is now such an extinguished flame of straw. The CUP spends a lot of money in order to intensify this movement. The people are loyal to the Government and loyal to the Sultan. This movement existed beyond of Konya...⁷³⁶

It is clear that Damat Ferid could not yet understood the reality of the National Forces. He tried to reflect that the National movement was an ordinary action and the National Forces were ordinary people. In that way, he insisted that the Nationalists were successors of the CUP and he refrained from recognizing the Anatolian Resistance as the fact.

A negative news about the National movement was published in *Alemdar*, which supported the İstanbul Government, and it made following comments about the National movement like that:

The most important newspapers in the world are busy with the Anatolian incident. It is not true that we should not reveal the inside of this matter. There are abnormal situations in Anatolia. Those who gave the National movement as an excuse used it against the Government. The National movement is not like this. The majority of those involved in the movement are Unionists. Not only acting like this but also even bearing such intent is murder at that time. We have to deal with these affairs with politics by sheathing our guns.⁷³⁷

According to *Alemdar*, the foreign press engaged in developments in Anatolia and the practices of the National Forces. Moreover, the newspaper confessed that there was a national movement in Anatolia, but it considered the Nationalists equal with

⁷³⁵ *Hakimiyet- Milliye*, No.15, 14 Mart 1336 [14.03.1920], p. 2. From *Le Temps*.

⁷³⁶ *Peyam*, No.277-35, 5 Eylül 1335 [5.09.1919], p. 1.

⁷³⁷ *Alemdar*, No.182-1582, 24 Eylül 1335 [24.09.1919], p. 1.

unionists. The newspaper implied that the unionists; or the Nationalists were the worst people in the world.

Peyam published a negative report on September 1919, and the paper accused the National Forces of disturbing the peace and order in the country:

...Whom do the new Jelalis of Anatolia, especially Mustafa Kemal deceive? What kind of heroism did they show to save İzmir? In Eastern Anatolia, they break the order and set the states against us by fighting. So to say, the National movement means to serve to the nation. Who are they cheating on?⁷³⁸

Peyam compared the National Forces to the Jelali rebels, who had lived in 16th century. The newspaper claimed that the National Forces caused turmoil in Anatolia as Jelali rebels had done. Also, the paper said that the Nationalists looted the people like Jelali.

Again, in an article published in *Alemdar*, the Anatolian movement was charged with *Unionism* and *brigandage* in order to dissuade people from inclining to the National movement. The editorial of Refik Halid in *Almedar* dated on January 9, 1920, can be shown as one of the best examples. Refik Halid stated in his article:

...If the state had provided the assistance of the Britain, can the Unionist steal? Can he (the Unionist) take to the hills and rob the peasants? Can he kill a man in the streets at night? So, what the Unionist will do is to be inclined to the policy of a state (Implied to Soviets) that does not know the country and to continue this danger of Unionism in its favor, or to steal what is possible in the wreckage and to escape after he has ruined the country with its pretext of independence...We cannot benefit from a controversy that will arise in the future because our position is not suitable for this. Therefore, what should do for us is the political unification under a single state. This state cannot be other than Britain.⁷³⁹

As mentioned before, Refik Halid defended the claim that Turkey could be saved only if a great power, namely Britain accepted to establish protectorate over Turkey. Also, he supposed that if Britain established mandate system over Turkey, abnormal developments in Anatolia, like emerging of the National movement and National Forces could be suppressed and the order could be assured again. These expressions, in fact, showed much better that some of the intellectuals' thoughts and tendency were also colonized at that period.

⁷³⁸ *Peyam*, No.297-55, 28 Eylül 1335 [28.09.1919], p. 1.

⁷³⁹ *Alemdar*, No.389-9268, 9 Kanun-i Sani 1336 [09.01.1920], p. 1.

Some journals claimed that this movement would be short-lived and would remain an ineffectual resistance even if it continued to be active for a certain period of time. In this regard, *Peyam-ı Sabah* gave coverage to an article taken from the French press. The newspaper was briefly suggested that “Mustafa Kemal's army was deteriorating day by day and that his regular forces were transformed into the armed form of gangs, which resulted in the increase of anarchy in Anatolia.” In the article, it was remarked as a prediction that in the face of developments, Mustafa Kemal's campaign would definitely come to an end.⁷⁴⁰

4.2.2. The Independent Armenia Project in the Eastern Anatolia and the Reaction of the Ankara Government

4.2.2.1. Capture of Kars by the National Forces

The Russians had seized Kars and its region with the Berlin Treaty signed in 1878. The Kars region was taken back after the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 and was annexed Turkey with the plebiscite. The Ottoman State, lost in the First World War, had to withdraw the Turkish Army behind the borders of 1914 by signing the Mondros Armistice and a local Turkish State was established there for a while. However, after a while, as a result of the military intervention of the British, the Armenians took possession of the territory. From this date forward, the Armenians also gazed on Erzurum province and for this reason the Ottoman Government had to follow a very careful politics in the region.⁷⁴¹

Moreover, as mentioned before, the Allied powers envisaged establishing a large Armenian state, including six provinces, Trabzon and three districts, with the Sevres Treaty. The Ankara Government had to react operationally to prevent the establishment of the Armenian state determined in the Sevres Treaty. Towards the end of 1920, the Allied powers were not in a position to prevent the military attempt

⁷⁴⁰ *Peyam-ı Sabah*, No.18, 18 Kanun-i Sani 1336 [18.01.1920], p. 1. From *Journal des Debats*.

⁷⁴¹ Tuncer Baykara, *Milli Mücadele*, (Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1985), p. 91.

by the Turks against Armenia because the Ankara Government suppressed the majority of internal rebellions and could stop the Greek invasion from the West.⁷⁴²

In this period, the Turks had two enemy states on the Eastern front. These were Armenia and Georgia. These small states were created mainly by the Entente Powers, especially Britain, as buffer zones against Bolshevik Russia. Thus, the British sought to stop the Bolshevik campaign with a group of states consisting of Armenia, Georgia and even Azerbaijan, to prevent Turkey from getting closer to Soviet Russia.⁷⁴³ However, Bolshevism began to spread among these states. It was more logical to attack Armenia rather than Georgia that was not considered as dangerous. Moreover, Armenians, who lived a comfortable life on the lands of the Ottoman Empire for centuries, slaughtered lots of civil people in the region during the years of the National Struggle, as they killed in the First World War.⁷⁴⁴

For this reason, Kazım Karabekir Pasha demanded to advance towards the Armenians on June 23, 1920, but he was not allowed to move immediately since, Georgia had an attack against the Turks while the army was in an offensive. Moreover, the attitude of Russians about the Armenian issue was unknown and there was possibility that the Russians would act at the side of the Armenians. Also, negotiations with Russian administrators in Moscow were not positive. Chicherin wanted the Turkish delegation to grant Van and Bitlis lands for Armenia.⁷⁴⁵ This hesitant politics of the Ankara Government encouraged the Armenians and they started to occupy some villages in the Oltu region on August 12, 1920. When the Armenians attacked the Turkish forces on August 20, the GNA gave the permission Kazım Karabekir Pasha on September 20, 1920, to attack Armenian. The Armenians started to assault on September 24, to the territory of Turks from the front of Bardiz. The Turkish troops took the offensive and captured Sarıkamış on September 29,

⁷⁴² These six provinces are consisted of Diyarbakır, Elazığ, Van, Bitlis, Erzurum, and Sivas. Three districts are Kars, Ardahan and Batum. Goloğlu, *Üçüncü Meşrutiyet*, p. 293; Baykara, *Ibid.*, p. 91. Lloyd George said at the meeting of the San Remo Conference on 23 April, 1920: "If Armenia is established without Erzurum, this means that Armenia will never be established." Eğer Erzurum'suz Ermenistan olacaksa, bu hiçbir zaman Ermenistan olamayacaktır anlamına gelir. See Ulubelen, *Ibid.*, p. 222.

⁷⁴³ Karabekir, *İstiklal Harbimiz*, Vol. III, p. 1115.

⁷⁴⁴ Elif Dönmez, "Mondros Ateşkes Antlaşması'nın Milli Mücadele'ye Yansımaları", (U.M.T.), (Nevşehir: Nevşehir Üniversitesi, 2012), p. 214; Tansel, *Ibid.*, Vol. III, pp. 232-233.

⁷⁴⁵ Goloğlu, *Üçüncü Meşrutiyet*, p. 297; Yalçın...[et al.]; *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 221.

1920, and Merdenek on September 30. But the Turkish army stayed in Sarıkamış on the line of Laloğlu until October 28, 1920, to control the possible reactions.⁷⁴⁶

The successful progress of the Turkish army further encouraged the nationalists in terms of absolute victory. Now, the city of Kars, which was in a very important position in the region, had to be seized. The General Staff emphasized the political and military advantages of capturing Kars are as follows: Firstly, from the military perspective, if the Armenians resisted in Kars, then the most of the Armenian army would be destroyed there and the any move forward of Georgian army would be prevented by the capturing of the area. Secondly, from the political perspective, the seizing of Kars would provide the opportunity to get rid of hostility between Turks and Armenians and to deal with problems in the peaceful way.⁷⁴⁷ The Eastern Front Command launched the Kars operation on October 29, 1920. As a result of the general attack on October 30, the Armenians were divided into two groups; some of them were withdrawn to the north of Vezinköy, some of them fled in the direction of Kars and in this way, the fortress of Kars were captured.⁷⁴⁸ The Armenians army, which settled in a secured emplacement, was completely defeated and many prisoners were taken. Among the prisoners; the Minister of War Araratof, the Chief of General Staff Vekilof, the Castellan of Kars Pirimof, and a civilian minister were also existed. The number of Armenian dead was about one thousand one hundred. Kazım Karabekir Pasha told Fevzi Pasha that “There are plenty of spoils in Kars that

⁷⁴⁶ Mustafa Keskin...[et al.]; *Türk İnkılabı ve Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Tarihi*, (Kayseri: Ufuk Yayınları, 1995), p. 113-114; Kazım Karabekir, *İstiklal Harbimizin Esasları*, prep. By Faruk Özerengin, (İstanbul, Emre Yayınları, 2000), p. 281-282; Tansel, *Ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 223. The occupation of Sarıkamış by the Eastern Front forces made Armenians worried. They were trying to figure out how far the operation would go and what would happen in the situation of the Caucasus if the Turkish Army won. On October 3, 1920, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Armenia Agacanyan issued a note to the Soviet Government. In the memorandum, it was asked whether they were informed about the attack of Turkish forces, and if Soviets knew any information, whether they would make an attempt on the stopping the operation. Also, It was stressed that the immediate stopping of the Turkish operations, not repeating in the future and the ensuring of the withdrawal of the Turkish Army would provide peaceful and sincere peace talks between Soviet Russia and the Armenian government. The Eastern Front Command reported this note to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the General Staff on the same day. In addition, the Armenian government tried to spread the Turkish campaign to the world public as an act directed at the destruction of Armenians. Mustafa Tektosun, “Milli Mücadele Döneminde Doğu Cephesi”, (U.M.T.), (Diyarbakır: Dicle Üniversitesi, 2007), p. 51.

⁷⁴⁷ *Türk İstiklal Harbi*, Vol. III, (Doğu Cephesi), (Ankara: Gnkur.B.B., 1965), p. 181.

⁷⁴⁸ *Türk İstiklal Harbi*, Vol. III, pp. 201-203.

would be to maintain a decade of the War of Independence.’’⁷⁴⁹ The GNA sent a special telegram to Kazım Karabekir Pasha containing greetings and thank-you notes upon the capturing the fortress of Kars.⁷⁵⁰ Kazım Karabekir Pasha, who was continuing to advance, seized Gümrü on November 7, 1920, as ‘‘hostage for the peace’’.⁷⁵¹

4.2.2.2. The News From the Eastern Front

News about the campaign launched on the Eastern Front began to reflect to Turkish press from the late September to early October. The İstanbul newspapers received the news about the developments in the East from the Armenian newspapers published in İstanbul. The sources of those newspapers were Armenian newspapers and news agencies in the Caucasus region.

As mentioned before, the Command of the Eastern Front carried out an operation against Sarıkamış on September 28, 1920, and Sarıkamış was seized on September 29, 1920. In the news about this event, it was reported that Armenia declared general mobilization when the news of the advance of the National Forces towards Oltu-Sarıkamış had been reached Armenia. According to the report, Armenia had asked what kind of attitude Georgia would take in the face of military developments. Georgia replied that all Armenians in the borders of Georgia were assigned to military service to help Armenia.⁷⁵²

Another news report published in the Armenian newspaper *Cağadamard* informed that there were very violent clashes in the Novoselim region and that the Turkish attack was spreading across the frontier from Oltu to Iğdır. In the news, it was suggested that the Georgian army was moving towards Ardahan to help Armenia.⁷⁵³

⁷⁴⁹ Karabekir, *İstiklal Harbimizin Esasları*, pp. 288- 291; Karabekir, *İstiklal Harbimiz*, Vol. IV, pp. 1879-1884; Mango, *From the Sultan to Atatürk*, p. 100.

⁷⁵⁰ Atatürk'ün Tamim, Telgraf ve Beyannameleri, p. 376.

⁷⁵¹ Baykara, *Ibid.*, p. 91.

⁷⁵² *Alemdar*, No.652-2952, 10 Teşrin-i Evvel 1336 [10.10.1920], p. 1.

⁷⁵³ *Alemdar*, No.653-2953, 11 Teşrin-i Evvel 1336 [11.10.1920], p. 1. From *Cağadamard*.

Another report published in *İkdam* suggested that the Turkish forces had not yet reached the Ardahan-Artvin region, and that the region was controlled by the Georgian army, which had passed through the Armenian border, in order to aid Armenia. In addition, the news expressed that the Georgian Government would give some transport and warfare requirements such as wagons, locomotives, gunpowder, fire and other warfare materials to Armenia. In the same news, it was taken place that the Turkish attack would enable to be removed the distrust between Armenia and Georgia. Indicatively, it was asserted that the demonstrations favored Armenia were organized everywhere in Georgia.⁷⁵⁴

Armenia applied to Soviet Russia and England to meet everything they needed for the war with the Turks. News on Armenians' requests for help was published in *İkdam*. The source of the news was the Armenian newspaper *Juguvert-Jamanak*. The newspaper wanted not to be left alone Armenia and Georgia, which had made a great effort against the Turkish army. Also, the newspaper believed that great success would be achieved by helping as much as half of the aid to Poland, which was fighting against Belgium, Serbia and Soviet Russia. The news also drew attention that the Turks were following the "expansionist policy", by arguing that the Turkish attack was not just against Armenia. On the other hand, it was emphasized that Armenia formed a breakwater against Panislamism and that everyone should help Armenia so that she could survive.⁷⁵⁵

After a while, the Turkish-Armenian war began to be questioned what the Turks intended in the operations in the East. The press wondered that what the Turks were expecting from the military campaign in the East. It was mentioned in the article taken from the Armenian newspaper that the Nationalists were thinking of establishing relations with Azerbaijan. It was also stated that the Turks aimed to provide "supplies and ammunition" through the Eastern Operation. Apart from these, the campaign in the East seemed closely related to the Treaty of Sevres at the same time. The newspaper, referring to the fact that Millerand had explained what the Entente Powers would do in the face of the difficulties that would arise during the

⁷⁵⁴ *İkdam*, No.8480, 15 Teşrin-i Evvel 1336 [15.10.1920], p. 1. From *Yerkir*.

⁷⁵⁵ *İkdam*, No.8480, 15 Teşrin-i Evvel 1336 [15.10.1920], p. 1. From *Juguvert-Jamanak*.

implementation of the Sevres Treaty, attributed the Armenian operation to “from the difficulties that the Allied powers mentioned before”. Therefore, it was emphasized that the Entente Powers would not be indifferent to it and that no self-sacrifice would be made about the independent Armenia desired to be formed in Sevres.⁷⁵⁶

The French press noticed that Turks were thinking of removing the Armenian and Georgian Governments in order to cooperate with the Bolsheviks and establish Soviet regime in these regions.⁷⁵⁷

Öğüt gave place the following thought about the Eastern operations. The editorial of the newspaper dated on November 3, 1920, highlighted that the military operation being carried out in the East was an attempt to protect the life and security of our country and that it could not be developed towards an expansionist purpose. The newspaper claimed that the Turkish and Muslim people in the East were exposed to “violent cruelty and massacre” and so it was required to *take precautions to prevent these events*. Thus, the newspaper defended the justification of the advance of the National Forces.⁷⁵⁸

As mentioned above, the city of Kars was seized by the Turkish forces on October 30, 1920. News about the capture of Kars began to reflect on the İstanbul press since November 1. The one of the remarkable news was published in *Vakit*. The newspaper wrote:

Kars, which was the main basis of the Armenian resistance, passed to the hands of the National Forces. The Armenian capital Yerevan was evacuated. The Armenians who were captured in Kars were counted 1254 people, including the “castle commander, two generals, twelve colonels, former War Minister and Chief of General Staff.”⁷⁵⁹

A report published again in *Vakit* dwelled on issue that the Armenians were resentful towards the Westerners because of their indifference and regardlessness. It was emphasized by the following statements:

The Armenian army will be obliged to make peace treaties... the Entente Powers will soon confront them, or the National Forces. The victory over Armenians will

⁷⁵⁶ *Vakit*, No.1018, No.8480, 9 Teşrin-i Evvel 1336 [09.10.1920], p. 1. From *Cağadamard*.

⁷⁵⁷ *Peyam-ı Sabah*, No.334, 1 Teşrin-i Sani 1336 [01.11.1920], p. 1. From *Journal des Debats*.

⁷⁵⁸ *Öğüt*, No.525, 3 Teşrin-i Sani 1336 [03.11.1920], p. 2..

⁷⁵⁹ *Vakit*, No.1050, 10 Teşrin-i Sani 1336 [10.11.1920], p. 2.

bring the Kemalists more insistent on their claims. It is not far from being approved of the Sevres Treaty by a decree of the Sultan... Both the confirmation of the Sevres Treaty and the current situation in the East will be suspended...⁷⁶⁰

In an article quoted from an Armenian journal, evaluating the military developments in the east, it was noticed that the interests of Turkish-Soviet Governments confronted with the contradictions. The newspaper suggested that the Turks would like to implement the Brest-Litovsk Treaty and but it did not serve the purpose of the Soviets. Also, the newspaper claimed that Mustafa Kemal would establish the Turkish-Tatar sovereignty in the future by supporting of Azerbaijan and North Caucasian Muslims. On the other hand, article insisted that the Bolsheviks had no intention to be deceived and to strengthen the Turks. At the end, it was understood that Soviets had begun to give up hostile attitude and action against Armenia.⁷⁶¹

The border of Great Armenia envisaged in the Sevres Treaty would be determined by American President Wilson. However, in the press, it was suggested that the borders determined by Wilson would no longer bear value. *Alemdar* reported that the Nationalists had not accepted the Sevres Treaty and that the border drawn by the President of American would not make any sense. Because there was no American army in order to be accepted these boundaries. In addition, the newspaper, emphasizing that the Allies would not be trusted either, and as a result, commented: “... it is certain that Wilson's refereeing will not bear any value or benefit for us... The task of determining the Armenian border will belong to only the Armenian army.”⁷⁶²

In its editorial on December 6, 1920, *Öğüt* also criticized the issue of Wilson's border. In the article, it was mentioned that the Armenians should based on their own army instead of relying on America. It was expressed that the political fait accompli of Armenians put them in different positions. As a result of this attemost, it caused the fall of the city of Kars and Gümürü and disintegration of the Armenian army. It

⁷⁶⁰ *Vakit*, No.1050, 10 Teşrin-i Sani 1336 [10.11.1920], p. 1.

⁷⁶¹ *Vakit*, No.1061, 21 Teşrin-i Sani 1336 [21.11.1920], p. 1. From *Jamanak*.

⁷⁶² *Alemdar*, No.681-2981, 8 Teşrin-i Sani 1336 [08.11.1920], p. 2. From *Yerkir*. The border determined by the American President was consisted of almost whole of the Eastern Anatolia, including Diyarbakır, Elazığ, Van, Bitlis, Sivas, Erzurum, Trabzon.

was proposed that the Armenians should give up *becoming tools in the hands of the European merchants* on the way of their development and progress.⁷⁶³

4.2.3. Military Victories of Against the Greeks in the Western Front

4.2.3.1. The First Battle of İnönü and its Results

In the west and in İstanbul the political climate was changing. Venizelos and Damat Ferid Pasha disappeared from the political scene. The change in Greece was fortuitous. Early in October 1920, King Alexander, while watching pair of monkeys in the garden of his palace, was bitten by one of them, and he died. Venizelos decided to hold a general election in on November 14, 1920. It was seen in the elections, royalists chose for the restoration of the throne of King Constantine, discredited and exiled in 1917 for complicity with the Germans. Then, they defeated Venizelos and his party. For this time, Rallis formed the Government in Greece.⁷⁶⁴

As it was mentioned before, in İstanbul, Sultan Vahdettin could no longer maintain Damat Ferid Pasha in power. He had been discredited both by the popular rejection of the Treaty of Sevres and by the failure of his civil war policy. The public saw him as a nonentity; or weakling, a figure of fun in a tragic situation. He was reputed to fall asleep at Cabinet meetings, and he had difficulty in finding ministers to serve under him. Also, his party, Freedom and Accord Party, turned against him, and the Sultan at last intimated that his services were no longer required. Thus, Damat Ferid Pasha resigned and retired to Carlsbad, to take a long cure. His place was again taken by Tevfik Pasha.⁷⁶⁵

Although the İstanbul Government tried to follow moderate policy towards the Nationalists, the royalists did not alter their hostile attitude against them. The supporters of the King chose to become, in this respect, more Venizelist than

⁷⁶³ *Öğüt*, No.559, 6 Kanun-i Evvel 1336 [06.12.1920], p. 1.

⁷⁶⁴ Öztoprak, *Ibid.*, p. 176.

⁷⁶⁵ Kinross, *Ibid.*, pp. 253-254.

Venizelos and they renewed the offensive policy against Ankara. Now, the strategy of the Greeks was to advance to the railway and to seize its key-points, Eskişehir and Afyonkarahisar, thus uniting their forces, cutting the communications of the Turks and driving them back upon Ankara and Konya respectively. A major advance must be delayed until the spring when the weather was favourable. But now, on January 10, 1921, they embarked on an interim action, which was in effect a reconnaissance in force. In this way, the King would prove that the Greece followed the policy of Venizelos against Anatolia. Moreover, just in these time, İsmet Pasha, the Commander of the Eastern Front, was trying to take under the discipline the forces of Çerkez Ethem forces, who did not want to join the regular army. Greeks preferred to embark on a campaign in such an environment.⁷⁶⁶

Greek offensive was launched from three directions between the northern and southern sectors of the front. They started to move forward territories of Bursa, Uşak and Afyonkarahisar on January 6, 1921. The Greeks had reached to around Eskişehir on January 9, after a three day walk. İsmet Pasha met them in a valley at İnönü, a position which had been partially fortified to cover the city. According to Sabahattin Selek, it is no coincidence that the battle occurred in the İnönü region. He said “the time of the İnönü battles was determined by the Greeks, but the battlefield was chosen by the Turks. According to the defense plan of the Turkish army, an enemy assault that would come from the direction of Bursa and Kocaeli would be met in İnönü.”⁷⁶⁷ The actual fighting began on January 10, 1921, at 6.30 am with the Greek offensive. The National army put up a resistance which surprised and disconcerted the Greeks. In the light of the earlier campaign, they had expected an easy walk-over against undisciplined and ill-equipped men. Instead they found themselves, for the first time, faced with a resolute and disciplined force.⁷⁶⁸ In mud and snow Turkish army stubbornly defended their own territory. After an all-day battle they counter-attacked with success. Next day the Greeks, fearing that they had fallen into a trap, accepted failure and retired, as speedily as they had come, to Bursa. Thus, the

⁷⁶⁶ Rahmi Apak, *İstiklal Savaşında Garp Cephesi Nasıl Kuruldu*, (Ankara: TTK, 1990), pp. 219-221; Selek, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 497-498.

⁷⁶⁷ Selek, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 499-500.

⁷⁶⁸ Apak, *Ibid.*, p. 221; Eroğlu, *Ibid.*, p. 237.

Turkish army composed of 4,500 defeated the 20.000-Greek army within three days and forced them to retreat.⁷⁶⁹

The Nationalists put emphasis on this first Battle of İnönü and as their first major victory against the foreigner it was celebrated in Ankara with unbounded rejoicing. Deputies in the Assembly expressed their thanks to the army. Then Mustafa Kemal Pasha flattered the deputies by praising their own behavior in the face of the threat. Their serenity had given the soldiers a feeling of confidence.⁷⁷⁰

The first Battle of İnönü was the first victory of regular army and the Ankara Government on the Western front. Turkish nation defeated its ill fate for the first time with this victory. Moreover, this first victory improved the local morale of the Turkish nation and strengthened the authority of GNA of Turkey both inside and outside with this victory. Moreover, the first Battle of İnönü showed that the GNA of Turkey would have sovereignty on the future of Turkey rather than the İstanbul Government.⁷⁷¹

The first İnönü victory also had an impact on international relations. As it was mentioned before, after this important victory of the National Government in the Western Front, the Moscow Treaty of Friendship was concluded with Soviet Russia. In this way, the authority of the Ankara Government was also approved in the international area. In addition to this, the Allied powers joined in a move towards peace. The Supreme Council invited delegates of the Turkish and Greek Governments to attend a conference in London in February 1921, under the presidency of Lloyd George, to consider a new solution of the Eastern question; in other words, a revision of the Treaty of Sevres. The revision of the Sevres Treaty was perceived as the first step of the process to remove it completely. It was also insisted that delegates from Ankara Government should form part of the İstanbul Government. This invitation was relayed Tevfik Pasha, Grand Vizier, to Mustafa

⁷⁶⁹ Apak, *Ibid.*, p. 222; Yalçın...[et al.]; *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 268; Kinross, *Ibid.*, p. 257.

⁷⁷⁰ Kinross, *Ibid.*, p. 257; Yalçın...[et al.]; *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 268-269; Selek, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 520.

⁷⁷¹ Nuri Köstüklü, "Birinci İnönü Muharebesi ve Siyasi Sonuçları Üzerine Bazı Düşünceler", *AAMD*, Vol. VII, No. 21 (1991), pp. 603-607; Apak, *Ibid.*, p. 227.

Kemal over the direct telegraph line between İstanbul and Ankara. This connection also meant *de facto* recognition of the Ankara Government by the Allied powers.⁷⁷²

Maneuvering tactically with a view to strengthening political position of Ankara, Mustafa Kemal replied that the invitation was a matter not for him but for the GNA of Turkey, the only lawful and independent sovereign power, which had lately been given constitutional form. Tevfik Pasha replied that this was a constitutional, hence domestic matter, appropriate for settlement after an agreement had been reached with the Allies. After long correspondances, Mustafa Kemal Pasha reported his refusal to be involved in any delegation formed under the presidency of İstanbul Government, “nothing but a discarded authority no longer wielding any power in the country.” Instead Ankara Government would send a separate and independent delegation of its own, which represented the Turkish people.⁷⁷³ Therefore, Bekir Sami Bey, who had resume his duties as Foreign Secretary on returning from Russia, was appointed the head of the delegation, consisted of Hüsrev (Gerede) Bey, Zekai Bey, Yunus Nadi Bey, Cami (Baykurt) Bey, Necati Bey, Sırrı (Belli) Bey, Mahmut Esat (Bozkurt) Bey, Niyazi Bey and Staff Captain Yümni Bey. Moreover, the Ankara Government would not take part in the London Conference unless it was specially invited to the conference, but in order to save time the Turkish delegation left for Rome, where it was greeted by Cont Sforza, the Italian Foreign Minister and chief Italian delegate to the conference. After Cont Sforza explicitly invited Ankara in the name of the Allied powers, the delegation left Rome to London.⁷⁷⁴

The conference started its negotiations on February 23, 1921, with the participation of the Allied powers, representatives of the İstanbul Government, representatives of the Ankara Government and representatives of the Greek Governments. In the conference, when Lloyd George allowed Tevfik Pasha to present the Turkish thesis, he said, “I leave the word to the representatives of the GNA of Turkey, which is the true representative of the Turkish nation.” This act was important in two respects.

⁷⁷² Metin Aydoğın, *Mustafa Kemal ve Kurtuluş Savaşı (1919-1923)*, (İzmir: Umay Yayınları, 2006), p. 281; Yalçın...[et al.]; *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 272.

⁷⁷³ Aydoğın, *Mustafa Kemal ve Kurtuluş Savaşı...*, p. 281.

⁷⁷⁴ Muhammet Güçlü, “Antalya’da Anadolu Gazetesine Göre Lomdra Konferansı’na Katılan Ankara Heyeti’nin Avrupa’ya Yolculuğu (6-22 Şubat 1921), *Çağdaş Türkiye Tarihi Araştırmaları Dergisi*, Vol. XVI, No. 33 (2016), p. 76-77; Selek, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 580-581.

Firstly, İstanbul officially recognized the authority of the Ankara Government. Secondly, all suspicions of states like France and Italy, which had a tendency to deal with the Nationalists, were gone. However, Tevfik Pasha laid the burden on the Ankara Government to take any result from the conference.⁷⁷⁵ Bekir Sami Bey successfully defended the national case of Turkey before the conference and he presented the provisions of the National Pact and tried to persuade the conference that the Turkish nation struggled for its full independence. The conference lasted from February 23, to March 12, 1921, but it did not produce any positive result.⁷⁷⁶

There were other important developments during the course of the London Conference. Bekir Sami Bey, who attend the London Conference as the chief delegate of the Ankara Government and served as the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government at the same time, had signed a series of bilateral agreements with Britain, France and Italy in London. These agreements, called *Accord Tripartite*, included economic and legal privileges, which undermined the understanding of full independence.⁷⁷⁷ For this reason, these agreements which were in conflict with the material and spirit of the National Pact were not accepted by Mustafa Kemal Pasha and Bekir Sami Bey was taken from the post.⁷⁷⁸ Mustafa Kemal Pasha considered Tripartite Agreements and ‘the London Conference’ as follows:

It is perfectly evident that the terms of these agreements which the Entente powers had induced Bekir Sami Bey, had no other aim than to cause our national Government to accept the Treaty which the same powers had concluded among themselves, under the name of the ‘‘Tripartite Agreements’’, after Sevres plan, and which divided Anatolia into three spheres of interest.⁷⁷⁹

As reported in the press, the first Battle of İnönü had a profound effect both inside and outside the country. According to a report published on January 21, in *Vakit*,

⁷⁷⁵ Selek, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 581-582; Yalçın...[et al.]; *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 273.

⁷⁷⁶ For the speech of Bekir Sami Bey, See *İkdam*, No.8611, 2 Mart 1337 [02.03.1921], p. 3; *Alemdar*, No.885-3085, 25 Şubat 1337 [25.02.1921], p. 1; *Hâkimiyet-i Milliye*, No.119, 27 Şubat 1337 [27.02.1921], p. 1. For the news relevant to developments of the conference, See *Alemdar*, No.889-3089, 1 Mart 1337 [01.03.1921], p. 1; *İkdam*, No.8621, 12 Mart 1337 [12.03.1921], p. 2; *Vakit*, No.1174, 17 Mart 1337 [17.03.1921], p. 1; *Hâkimiyet-i Milliye*, No.136, 18 Mart 1337 [18.03.1921], p. 1; *Açıksöz*, No.137, 20 Mart 1337 [20.03.1921], p. 2; *Öğüt*, No.603, 17 Mart 1337 [17.03.1921], p. 1.

⁷⁷⁷ Aydoğan, *Mustafa Kemal ve Kurtuluş Savaşı...*, pp. 282-283; Jaeschke, *İngiliz Belgeleri*, p. 153. For the details of the agreements signed with Britain, France and Italy, See İzzet Öztoprak, ‘‘Dışişleri Bakanı Bekir Sami Bey’in İstifası Meselesi’’, *AAMD*, Vol. IX, No. 25 (1992), pp. 99-101.

⁷⁷⁸ Öztoprak, ‘‘Dışişleri Bakanı Bekir Sami Bey’in...’’, p. 102; Selek, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 586-589.

⁷⁷⁹ Atatürk, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 5.

Greece wanted to prove its military power to the Allied powers with the attack on Anatolia. Furthermore, Greece would have shown that it was strong enough to fulfill the task of implementing the Treaty of Sevres completely.⁷⁸⁰

Another article published in *İkdam* stated that the Greek army had to withdraw due to its failure in the assaults in Anatolia because King Costantin was lack of military qualities. The newspaper also mentioned things that the Greeks expected from the first Battle of İnönü:

After the Greek army occupied Bilecik, it would continue to advance rapidly towards the Eskişehir-Ankara railway. This attempt aimed to prevent transportation and to divide Mustafa Kemal's armies into two part. After Eskişehir was seized, the Nationalists would not be able to resist and from that point on, the road to Ankara would have been opened. In Athens, King Constantine was already preparing to enter Ankara.⁷⁸¹

An editorial from the Bulgarian press suggested that it was an experience, despite the publication of news that the Greek offensive launched in Anatolia would force Turkish nationalists to seek forgiveness. In this battle, Constantine would testify that he could achieve the duty which had been burdened on the shoulders of Greece with the help of his military generals rather than those of Venizelos. However, this attack revealed that Greece had no power and ability to make realize its obligation, namely, the task of securing peace in the Near East. The newspaper hoped that top executives of the Allied powers in the Paris would take the lessons from these attacks.⁷⁸²

In another article from the British press, it was stated that the Sevres Treaty could not be executed in the region that was vital for Britain because the treaty deprived of Turkey's large and extremely economically important port by giving a wide range of productive land to Greece. Moreover, Greece could not fulfill its required responsibilities. The long-term campaign of the army caused that the general elections in Greece resulted in favor of the royalists. British newspaper put forward that the powerful army of Turkey gathered around Mustafa Kemal whereas the Greek army in Anatolia lost its effectiveness day by day. The newspaper suggested that the following wishes should be accepted in order to resolve the Turkish problem: "The

⁷⁸⁰ *Vakit*, No.1120, 21 Kanun-i Sani 1337 [21.01.1921], p. 1. For the similar news, See *İkdam*, No.8569, 19 Kanun-i Sani 1337 [19.01.1921], p. 1.

⁷⁸¹ *İkdam*, No.8584, 3 Şubat 1337 [03.02.1921], p. 2.

⁷⁸² *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, February 13,, 1921, p. 1. From *Echo de Bulgari*.

Turks asked to be changed the single exit of Anatolia, the autonomy of Thrace, Capitulations, and the provisions relevant to the financial conditions of the Sevres Treaty and the inspection of the Bosphorus.’’⁷⁸³

4.2.3.2. The Second Battle of İnönü and its Results

During the period of the London Conference, the positions of Greek and Turkish armies were as follows: A strong part of the Greek army was at Bursa and to the east of this city; another part was at Uşak and to the east of Uşak. Turkish troops were in two groups, to the north-west of Eskişehir and at Dumlupınar and to the east of it. In addition the Greeks had a division at İzmit and Ankara had troops at Kocaeli. Also, Ankara had other forces to oppose the Greeks along the river Menderes.⁷⁸⁴

While the Turkish delegates in London were on the road, on March 23, 1921, the large portions of the Greek army launched an offensive from Bursa and Uşak, with the full knowledge of Lloyd George and the financial aids of Britain. After the first Battle of İnönü, a short time passed. The Greeks did not anticipate that the Turkish army would be able to recover it and fight in this short time. They considered that they could reach to their targets by attacking in different directions in the free territory.⁷⁸⁵ Against this attack, the Turkish troops on the Western Front under the command of İsmet Pasha were concentrated north-west of Eskişehir. Ankara decided to accept battle in the position at İnönü, and necessary coordinations and preparations were made. The two-pronged attack of the Greeks was aimed against Eskişehir in the north and against Afyonkarahisar in the south. On the evening of March 26, the enemy approached the advanced positions. The next day Turkish forces get in touch with the enemy along the whole line of the front. On March 28, 1921, the enemy began to attack the right side of Turkish forces army. On 29th March 29, they attacked both flanks and gained important local success. The 30th March was a day of violent fighting. These battles were ended in favour of the Greek forces. Moreover,

⁷⁸³ *İkdam*, No.8569, 19 Kanun-i Sani 1337 [19.01.1921], p. 2. From *Morning Post*.

⁷⁸⁴ Atatürk, *Ibid.*, vol. II, p. 5.

⁷⁸⁵ Ayferi Göze, *Türk Kurtuluş Savaşı ve Devrimi Tarihi*, (İstanbul: Sermet Matbaası, 1989), p. 145; Aydoğan, *Mustafa Kemal ve Kurtuluş Savaşı...*, p. 287; Selek, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 597-598.

Greek forces captured Afyon without too much difficulty, and then established themselves to the east of it on the road towards Konya, forcing Ankara to withdraw forces from the north to hold them.⁷⁸⁶

On March 31, 1921, İsmet Pasha began a counter-attack, defeated the enemy on the same night and drove the Greek forces back once more. This victory was recorded in the history of the revolution as the second Battle of İnönü.⁷⁸⁷ In fact, Turkish army had awesome struggle against the Greeks. An American correspondent with the Greeks, named Earnest Hemingway, narrated the quality difference between two sides in the battlefield as follows:

The Greek artillery, under the command of the newly arrived Constantine officers that did not know a god-damned thing, had fired into Greek troops and the British observer had cried like a child. It was the first time he had seen 'dead men wearing white ballet skirts and upturned shoes with pompoms on them. The Turks had come steadily and lumpily, and running there themselves and he and the British observer had run to until his lungs ached and his mouth was full of the taste of pennies and they stopped behind some rocks and there were the Turks coming as lumpily as ever.⁷⁸⁸

After the battle, Mustafa Kemal Pasha and Fevzi Pasha sent telegraphs to İsmet Pasha, congratulating him on this great victory. Mustafa Kemal said in his telegraph to İsmet Pasha:

There have rarely been commanders in history who have taken upon themselves so difficult a task as you have in the battle at İnönü... You have not only defeated the enemy but at the same time have reversed the unhappy/ill fate of the nation... The greed of the enemy has been shattered and broken up on the rugged rocks of your resolution and zeal. In congratulating you on your great triumph and this victory, which will record your name honourably in the annals of history and which fills the whole nation with eternal gratitude to you...⁷⁸⁹

Indeed, the second Battle of İnönü was a turning-point in the Nationalist fortunes, as Mustafa Kemal recognized. The Nationalists, still inferior in numbers and equipment, had proved themselves superior in strategy to the Greeks. Lord Kinross, described the second Battle of İnönü as the prospect of the final victory, comments on this battle:

⁷⁸⁶ İsmet İnönü, *Hatıralar*, prep. By Sabahattin Selek, (İstanbul: Bilgi Yayınevi, 2009), pp. 238-240; Göze, *Ibid.*, p. 145; Selek, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 600-601; Kinross, *Ibid.*, p. 265.

⁷⁸⁷ İnönü, *Ibid.*, pp. 240-241.

⁷⁸⁸ Quoted from Aydoğan, *Mustafa Kemal ve Kurtuluş Savaşı...*, pp. 287-288.

⁷⁸⁹ İnönü, *Ibid.*, p. 241; Atatürk, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 5; Göze, *Ibid.*, p. 145.

The old military spirit of the Turk had revived. A new army had been created, and it was led by young officers well trained in the art of modern warfare. From now onwards Kemal could see ahead of him, however remotely and faintly, the prospect of possible victory.⁷⁹⁰

In the press, the second Battle of İnönü had repercussions both interior and outside and some greeting telegrams of foreign statesmen, celebrating the victory, were published in newspapers. The representative of the Soviet Russian Foreign Ministry informed Mustafa Kemal Pasha that he was glad that the Nationalists were once again successful in countering the new efforts of Western imperialism to take the main land of the Turkish nation under their feet. He also reminded that they accepted with sorrow the inhuman movements that Greeks had made while retreating and the representative of Russia added that they watched with great interest the way that the Turkish nation had chosen to maintain its national existence. In the meantime, the representative sent 30.000 Ruble in order to be alleviated the poverty of the people.⁷⁹¹

Mustafa Kemal Pasha responded to telegram of the Soviet representative, Medivani, with a letter. Mustafa Kemal emphasized that after expressing his appreciation for the help made, “the stance of Soviet Russia against the greedy imperialists and the miserable Greeks would be appreciated by the Turkish nation.” He further explained that the damages and destruction that the Greeks had done during their withdrawal were something that the human conscience could not accept. Also, Mustafa Kemal demanded Soviet Russia to publish these savageries in the Russian press in far-reaching.⁷⁹²

An article taken from the Greek press after the second Battle of İnönü examined the speech of Greek Prime Minister Gunaris, who had just come to power, in the Assembly. Gunaris argued that the three generations in Greece should be mobilized upon attempt of the Turks starting to collect troops in Anatolia. Regarding the second of Battle of İnönü, Gunaris claimed that the offensive of the Greek army was completely successful. He explained the purpose of this successful initiative as

⁷⁹⁰ Kinross, *Ibid.*, p. 266.

⁷⁹¹ *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, No.157, 13 Nisan 1337 [13.04.1921], p. 2.

⁷⁹² *Hâkimiyet-i Milliye*, No.163, 19 Nisan1337 [19.04.1921], p. 1. Also, the greeting telegram of Şeyh Sünisi was published in the same issue of the newspaper.

follows: “The Greek offensive was aimed to accomplish the national demands, which the Greek patriots have attempted to achieve for many centuries.” It is clear that the Greeks had acted with a thought of conquest policy.⁷⁹³ *İkdam* published an editorial evaluating this discourse of Gunaris. According to the newspaper, “Prime Minister Gunaris, in order to appease the Greek public, had spoken a lot of words contradicting to the real situation.” However, these were not enough to quell public suspicions. As understood from the telegram read in the Greek Parliament, Fener Greek Patriarchate also declared war against Turkey with the Greece.⁷⁹⁴

In the news published in *İkdam*, by taking from Venizelist newspaper *Eleftheros Tipos*, it was reported that the actual result of the second Battle of İnönü was hidden and the Greek nation was deceived. In addition, it was written that the failure of the Greeks army was known very well by the military advisors of the Allied powers and the Turks. Another Venizelist newspaper *Patris*, published a report based on news sent from the fronts and it revealed that the Greek offensive resulted in a much greater failure than official explanations. Furthermore, the newspaper argued about the Greek attack and the general political situation:

The last military attack had been run without the material and moral support that the Entente powers have granted up to now. Since the Treaty of Sevres has begun to be interpreted as an invalid political document in the signatory states, at this stage we are not their deputies.⁷⁹⁵

Another news, from the British press, wrote that the battle ended with retire of the Greek army with numerous losses. The news attributed the failure of the Greeks to Mustafa Kemal's awareness of the war strategy of the Greeks and to courageously defending the important locations leading to Ankara. The article claimed that this failure would shake up the Greek Government despite its irresponsibility. Moreover, according to the British newspaper, the second Battle of İnönü also revealed that the “prophecy” that the Athens Government claimed to ruin Turkish Nationalists within three weeks was groundless.⁷⁹⁶

⁷⁹³ *Alemdar*, No.16, 13 Nisan 1337 [13.04.1921], p. 1.

⁷⁹⁴ *İkdam*, No.8655, 15 Nisan 1337 [15.04.1921], p. 1.

⁷⁹⁵ *İkdam*, No.8659, 19 Nisan 1337 [19.04.1921], p. 2. From *Eleftheros Tipos* and *Patris*.

⁷⁹⁶ *Açıksöz*, April 17, 1921, p. 2.

An article taken from French newspaper *Le Temps* compared Turkey in 1920 and 1921. The newspaper emphasized that the Treaty of Sevres did not drive Indian Muslims to desperation; on the contrary, it made them annoyed with Britain. *Le Temps* claimed that Britain thought that it had to crush the Turks, which Muslims set their hopes on, in order to provide peace in India. Greece could be used for this purpose. Thus, the Greeks, who received the necessary help from Britain, dared to attack to Ankara. The newspaper also mentioned that in the 1920s Turkish Nationalists were forced to sign the Treaty of Sevres, but when it came to 1921, the Entente powers brought it to the agenda for the purpose of examining and amending. *Le Temps* drew the attention that those, who had attempted to exploit İstanbul against Ankara in 1920, witnessed that İstanbul and Ankara found a compromise with each other in 1921.⁷⁹⁷

4.2.3.3. The Battle of Sakarya and its Results

The Allied powers, following the breakdown of the London Conference, declared their neutrality in the Greco-Turkish war. However, neither this decision nor the Greek defeat at İnönü had any effect on King Constantine, who preferred to believe that Lloyd George would still give him backing even his Government did not do. Nearly three months had passed since the second Battle of İnönü. The Greek army was equipped with respect to weapons, subsistence and soldiers within the three months. The full mobilization was declared in Greece and all men between 18-45 ages were recruited in Greece and the Greek Government levied extra taxes on the people. Moreover, the Government, by violating international rules, recruited local Greeks/ Rums in Western Anatolia and Thrace.⁷⁹⁸ Besides, Britain granted weapon, ammunition and plane to the Greek army. The military power and the number of equipment increased in favor of the Greek forces. They had 88. 000 guns, 7000

⁷⁹⁷ *Hâkimiyet-i Milliye*, No.168, 25 Nisan 1337 [25.04.1921], p. 1. Also See *Alemdar*, No.23, 19 Nisan 1337 [19.04.1921], p. 1. From *Le Temps*.

⁷⁹⁸ Aydoğın, *Mustafa Kemal ve Kurtuluş Savaşı...*, p. 289; Kinross, *Ibid.*, p. 267.

machine guns and 300 cannon; on the other hand, the Turkish army had 40.000 guns, only 700 machine guns and 177 cannon.⁷⁹⁹

King Constantine proclaimed himself as Supreme Commander of the Greek forces in Anatolia and on June 13, 1921, he left for İzmir and he was welcomed as the Commander of the Crusade. Then he left to inspect the front and to decide on the date of the new offensive.⁸⁰⁰ After the preparations, the Greek army started general attack on July 10, 1921, and the initial objective was the railway. This time, the main attack came in the south instead of the north, and it was aimed at Afyonkarahisar and Kütahya rather than Eskişehir; however, the Greeks planned to take Eskişehir, the key to western Anatolia, by a turning movement from the south.⁸⁰¹ In fact, this plan was successful. From Bursa the Greeks sent one column eastwards to hold the Turkish northern forces, another south-eastward, by a march through the mountains to attack Kütahya; from Uşak, which had the advantage of a direct railway link with İzmir, they sent a third and stronger column to attack Afyonkarahisar. They captured it, and then moved northwards up the railway to converge with the second force and capture Kütahya.⁸⁰² The offensive of the Greeks was the signal for a series of battles known as the battles of Kütahya-Eskişehir, which lasted for fifteen days. Since Eskişehir and its communications with Ankara were immediately threatened with surrounding, Turkish troops had to retire on the evening of July 25, 1921, eastward across the river Sakarya.⁸⁰³

The failure of the Turkish army in battles of Kütahya-Eskişehir led to public unrest and the first excitement became apparent in the Assembly. The representatives of the opposition immediately began to make pessimistic speeches in all possible tones:

Where is this army going? Where are the people being led? There must surely be somebody who is responsible for what is being done! Where is the person? He is invisible. We would like to see at the head of the army the actual originator of the sad and deplorable position in which we are today.⁸⁰⁴

⁷⁹⁹ Aydoğan, *Mustafa Kemal ve Kurtuluş Savaşı...*, p. 289.

⁸⁰⁰ Selek, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 641.

⁸⁰¹ Atatürk, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 412-413; Selek, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 641.

⁸⁰² Aydoğan, *Mustafa Kemal ve Kurtuluş Savaşı...*, p. 290; Selek, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 641; Kinross, *Ibid.*, p. 268.

⁸⁰³ İnönü, *Ibid.*, pp. 246-248; Göze, *Ibid.*, pp. 153-154.

⁸⁰⁴ Atatürk, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 413-414; Göze, *Ibid.*, pp. 154-155.

There was no doubt that the the person to whom these people were alluding was none other than Mustafa Kemal Pasha. Finally, Selahattin Bey, deputy of Mersin, mentioned his name from the tribune and asked him to take over the command. The number of those who shared this opinion grew, while there were others who opposed the idea.⁸⁰⁵ The entire Assembly came to conclusion that Mustafa Kemal's taking actual charge of the supreme command was to be regarded as the last step and the last resolution. Therefore, Mustafa Kemal Pasha put forward the following proposal to the Presidency of the Assembly on August 4, 1921:

At the request of the members of the Assembly and according to the general desire expressed by them, I accept the Supreme Command. I will take over this position provided that I shall actually exercise the full powers appertaining to the Assembly, for the purpose of being able to pursue as rapidly as possible the advantages resulting from the fact that these functions have been bestowed on me and that we may be able rapidly to increase and reinforce the strength of our army in material and morale and secure for it a strong leadership. In order to show the nation once more that I have been throughout my life the most faithful advocate of the idea of national sovereignty, I request at the same time that these full powers shall be limited to the short period of about three months.⁸⁰⁶

After Mustafa Kemal Pasha assumed the authority of Supreme Command, he published an edict under the title *Orders respecting Requisitions* and he started to take measures in order to increase the actual strength of men and means of transport, and to secure and regulate the provisioning and clothing of the troops. In this way, he tried to prepare the Turkish people for total war.⁸⁰⁷

On August 12, 1921, Mustafa Kemal Pasha and Chief of the General Staff, Fevzi Pasha, following the preparations, left for Polatlı, where the headquarters at the front were. Then, they began to inspect the front. They arrived at the opinion that the enemy, as soon as the Greeks came into touch with the Turkish army, would attempt an enveloping movement on the left flank of Turkish front. In view of this possibility, Mustafa Kemal Pasha took all the necessary steps.⁸⁰⁸

It is possible to be divided into phases the Battle of Sakarya, which took place between August 23, 1921, and September 13, 1921, in terms of the development of

⁸⁰⁵ Atatürk, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 413-414.

⁸⁰⁶ Atatürk, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 415; Göze, *Ibid.*, pp. 155-156; İnönü, *Ibid.*, p. 250.

⁸⁰⁷ Göze, *Ibid.*, p. 157; İnönü, *Ibid.*, p. 250.

⁸⁰⁸ Atatürk, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 418-419; Göze, *Ibid.*, p. 158; İnönü, *Ibid.*, p. 251.

it. The first phase included the date of August 23, when the Greek attack began and the date of September 6, 1921, when the offensive was broken down. The second phase contained the period when the Turks began to attack on September 10, and won a great victory on September 13, 1921. As Mustafa Kemal Pasha foresaw, the Greek army started to advance and came into contact with the Turkish front on August 23, 1921. Many bloody and critical phases, advances and retreats, took place on both sides. The enemy, superior in number, broke through line of defence of Turkish army in several places, but each time, Turkish soldiers succeeded in throwing forces against the enemy.⁸⁰⁹ The battle took place on a front of a hundred kilometres. The left wing of the front had withdrawn to a distance of fifty kilometres south of Ankara. The line of defence of the Turkish forces was broken through in sections, but every place where it was pierced was immediately reinforced in as short a time as possible.⁸¹⁰ Under these circumstances, Mustafa Kemal Pasha gave following order to all army in order to reinforce the effort of the Turkish troops: “There was no line of defence but a plain of defence, and that this plain was the whole of the country. Not an inch of the country should be abandoned until it was drenched with the blood of the citizens.”⁸¹¹

Until on September 6, 1921, every men of the Turkish army obeyed this principle and fought step by step with the greatest devotion; and thus it crushed the superior enemy forces, deprived them of their power of attack and, of the possibility of continuing their offensive. As soon as the Turkish troops noticed the exhaustion of the Greek army in the battle, they started a counter-attack on September 10, 1921, especially with the right wing east of the Sakarya River against the left wing of the enemy, and then against the chief parts of the front. The great Battle of Sakarya lasted for twenty-two days and nights and finally the Greek army was defeated and forced to retire to its previous line. While the Greeks retreated, they did not abstain from burning and destroying every place and they left two hundred and fifty

⁸⁰⁹ Arnold J. Toynbee, *Türkiye: Bir Devletin Yeniden Doğuşu*, Vol. II, Trans. By Kasım Yargıcı (İstanbul: Çağdaş Matbaacılık ve Yayıncılık, 2000), p. 15.

⁸¹⁰ H. C. Armstrong, *Bozkurt*, trans. By Ahmet Çuhadar, (İstanbul: Kamer Yayınları, 2016), p. 158.

⁸¹¹ Atatürk, *Ibid.*, ol. II, p. 419; Göze, *Ibid.*, p. 158.

kilometers – desert behind.⁸¹² On September 13, 1921, there was no trace of the enemy at the east of the Sakarya River. Mustafa Kemal Pasha afterwards claimed that “the great Battle of Sakarya was a unique example of a battle of the widest extent, not only in the historical records of the new Turkish State but also in the pages of the world’s history.”⁸¹³ After the battle, the GNA of Turkey promoted Mustafa Kemal Pasha to the rank of Marshal, with the title of Gazi.⁸¹⁴

With the Battle of Sakarya, the conditions in the Turkish-Greco War became reversed; the Turkish army, which had been in defense condition until this battle, took offensive position against the Greek army, which had followed offensive policy. Moreover, it can be regarded that the Battle of Sakarya was one of the greatest wars of twentieth century. Clair Price said assessed this battle as follows in his work *The Rebirth of Turkey*:

The Turkish victory on the banks of the Sakarya radically changed the political complexion of the Near and Middle East. For 200 years, the West had been breaking down the old Ottoman Empire, but on the Sakarya River it encountered the Turk himself and when it touched the Turk the tide of history turned. History will one day find in this obscure engagement on the Sakarya one of the decisive battles of our era.⁸¹⁵

During the one-year serenity following the Battle of Sakarya, the Ankara Government saved plenty of time in order to gather the strength and to re-equip the army with new guns and supplies.

During the days of the Battle of Sakarya, many Turkish newspapers published news in addition to the foreign news about the war. *Açıksöz* published news taken from the French press, including information about the first developments in Sakarya. According to the report, the Greeks attacked with all their forces in a continuous and violent manner and occupied several trenches and positions. But these successes did not have any influence on determining the result of the war.⁸¹⁶

⁸¹² Ergün Aybars, *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Tarihi*, Vol. I, (İzmir: Ege Üniversitesi, 1984), p. 289; Armstrong, *Ibid.*, p. 160; Toynbee, *Ibid.*, p. 15; Göze, *Ibid.*, pp. 158-159.

⁸¹³ Atatürk, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 419; Kinross, *Ibid.*, p. 277; İnönü, *Ibid.*, p. 254.

⁸¹⁴ Aybars, *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Tarihi*, p. 289; Armstrong, *Ibid.*, p. 163; Toynbee, *Ibid.*, p. 16; Göze, *Ibid.*, p. 159.

⁸¹⁵ Clair Price, *The Rebirth of Turkey*, (New York: Thomas Seltzer, 1923), p. 188.

⁸¹⁶ *Açıksöz*, No.280, 11 Eylül 1337 [11.09.1921], p. 1. From *Le Temps*.

Peyam-ı Sabah published a report on developments of the frontline based on the British newspaper, *Daily Telegraph*. The newspaper relayed that the quantity of the Turkish army was over 75,000 and that the Greeks launched an offensive with their northern and central troops and that they attempted to the turning movement with the forces located in south. As the newspaper reported that Mustafa Kemal followed the war strategy of the Greeks carefully and he immediately took measures against their move. The British newspaper had also published a letter sent by a Greek soldier who fought on the front. The letter was included the following informations: “The Turks are wrestling stubbornly. When they have received an order to defend their trenches, they do not leave it until the last minute. We cannot capture the trenches of the Turks at any time unless we destroy their defenses.”⁸¹⁷

Hakimiyet-i Milliye, by quoting from another British newspaper *Dail Express*, reported news, including views on the purpose of the Greek army. According to the news, the Greek army intended not only to capture a certain piece of territory but to destroy the Turkish army entirely. In addition, there was an issue, should not be underestimated, that if the Turks could have enough means of transportation, they could be able to drive the Greek forces into the sea. Besides, the newspaper mentioned that the Greeks were trying to chew the gobbet they could not swallow as the Marshal Foch had said a year ago.⁸¹⁸

Hakimiyet-i Milliye published another report from the French press about the Greeks’ purposes and it indicated that the Greeks were thinking of seizing İstanbul; however, this was nothing but a dream. According to the news, there was constant propagation to be held the coronation ceremony in London for the Emperor Constantine XII. Moreover, the newspaper put forward that a Greek-Byzantine empire, establishing in the control of Britain, would pose a constant threat to peace in eastern, and also it claimed that Turkey and the Balkan countries would not allow it.⁸¹⁹ These news and comments tell us that the Greeks aimed far beyond defeating the Turkish army in the Battle of Sakarya and they were in pursuit of dreams that were in the depths of history and impossible to be resurrected.

⁸¹⁷ *Peyam-ı Sabah*, No.603, 5 Eylül 1337 [05.09.1921], p. 1. From *Daily Telegraph*.

⁸¹⁸ *Hâkimiyet-i Milliye*, No.313, 5 Teşrin-i Evvel 1337 [05.10.1921], p. 1. From *Daily Express*.

⁸¹⁹ *Hâkimiyet-i Milliye*, No.311, 3 Teşrin-i Evvel 1337 [03.10.1921], p. 1. From *Le Temps*.

After the Battle of Sakarya, news about the conflict continued to publish in the press. In a report published in *Peyam-ı Sabah*, it was relayed that the Greek offensive had turned into a defense since September 7, 1921, and that the Turkish national army began to make violent attack on the center and left flanks of the Greeks. The newspaper also indicated that there was no confirmatory information about the general retreat of the Greek army towards Eskişehir. According to the newspaper, a decisive military success was attributable to the possible the capture of Ankara by destruction of the Turkish army, or the possibility of being forced the Greeks to retire towards İzmir.⁸²⁰

In another news report from the French press, made the following comments on the retreat of the Greek forces in the Battle of Sakarya:

...It is a fact that the Greek General Staff had to give up to seize of Ankara, which it had made a great effort. The most serious is that the Greek army abandoned the destruction of the National Forces. The strong Turkish army tried to bothering the troops of King Constantine even during their retreat. Under these circumstances it can be accepted that Greek Supreme Military Command has no longer hoped to achieve a permanent military outcome...⁸²¹

A report from the Bulgarian newspaper, *Den*, indicated that the retreat of the Greeks was the proof that they would not accomplish their goals in Anatolia. It also draws attention that deal with the Anatolian problem based on force was so difficult issue.⁸²²

A report published in *Peyam-ı Sabah* mentioned that the victory of the Battle of Sakarya, won by the Turkish army, provided widespread display of endearments and rejoicing movements in Tbilisi. Furthermore, the representative of the Soviet Russia at the meeting held by the representatives of the Muslim people on September 14, 1921, expressed satisfaction with the victory. As indicated in the news, Soviet representative made the following comments about the success of the Turkish army: “We believe that the Turkish army will finally strike great and decisive blow to the

⁸²⁰ *Peyam-ı Sabah*, No.619, 21 Eylül 1337 [21.09.1921], p. 1. From *Le Temps*.

⁸²¹ *Peyam-ı Sabah*, No.623, 25 Eylül 1337 [25.09.1921], p. 1. From *Le Temps*.

⁸²² *Hâkimiyet-i Milliye*, No.317, 9 Teşrin-i Evvel 1337 [09.10.1921], p. 1. From *Den*.

enemy who had acted insolently by attacking the Turkish territory and that the time of being droven of its enemy into the sea is not far away.’’⁸²³

4.3. Political Agreements of the Ankara Government

4.3.1. The Gümrü Treaty With Armenia and its Importance

After Turkish army captures Gümrü from Armenians, they had to offer a truce. The Eastern Front Command reported this situation to Ankara and also reported the conditions for the armistice to Armenians. Although the Armenians accepted the conditions for the temporary armistice, the main conditions of the armistice proposed by the GNA were rejected on November 8, 1920. Then the war was resumed. On 14 November 1920, the Turkish army re-attacked. The Armenians, who suffered from the turmoil in the face of the Turkish army, declared that they accepted the truce conditions on November 17, 1920. The truce was ensured on November 18, and peace talks began immediately.⁸²⁴ For the peace talks, the Eastern Front Commander Kazım Karabekir, the Governor of Erzurum Hamid and Deputy of Erzurum Necati Bey were elected as negotiators. The talks began on November 26, 1920 at Gümrü. Ultimately, 2-3 December 1920, the Treaty of Gümrü, consisting of eighteen provisions, was signed.⁸²⁵ The Armenians acknowledged that the Treaty of Sevres was invalidated by Article 10 of the treaty. Also, it was written in the last article that the valid text was that of Turkish copy when there would occur a dispute related to the Gümrü Treaty.⁸²⁶

⁸²³ *Peyam-ı Sabah*, No.658, 30 Teşrin-i Evvel 1337 [30.10.1921], p. 1. From *Verçinlor*.

⁸²⁴ Keskin...[et al.]; *Ibid.*, p. 114; *Türk İstiklal Harbi*, Vol. III, pp. 212-215.

⁸²⁵ Safiye Işıl Karaca, “Milli Mücadele Döneminde Türk-Ermeni İlişkileri (1919-1923)”, (U.M.T.), (Kahramanmaraş: Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam Üniversitesi, 2010), p. 47; Karabekir, *İstiklal Harbimiz*, Vol. IV, p. 1893. Goloğlu, *Üçüncü Meşrutiyet*, pp. 301-302. Mango, *From the Sultan to Atatürk*, pp. 101-102.

⁸²⁶ İsmet Pasha sent a telegram to Kazım Karabekir Pasha and congratulated him as follows: “You open our future with the victory that you gave as a gift to our and history. You gave the light to everybody's health and hope.” See Karabekir, *İstiklal Harbimiz*, Vol. IV, p. 1895.

With the Treaty of Gümrü, the GNA Army had won its first military and political success. The first treaty signed by the Ankara Government enabled that Kars, Sarıkamış, Kağızman, Kulp and Iğdır, which the Ottoman Empire had lost, was once again included in the territory of Turkey. In this way, the national borders, envisaged in the National Pact for the Caucasus, were being realized in great extent and the invalidity of the Treaty of Sevres Peace was actually proven.⁸²⁷ Besides, the Armenian issue was solved and the peace process with Armenia was started. Armenia was thus the first eastern state to recognize the GNA of Turkey.

The security of Eastern region was ensured and this provided the chance of access to the Soviet Union. Many weapons and ammunitions were obtained from the Armenians. The military aid from the east to west provided great facilities on the Western Front. Moreover, the victory of Turkish troops under the command of Kazım Karabekir on the Eastern Front was a great source of moral for the Turkish people.⁸²⁸

After this great victory Karabekir Pasha enshrined in the heart of Turkish people as the Savior of Eastern Anatolia, and as the conqueror of Kars. In addition, Kazım Karabekir signed the Gümrü Treaty in favor of Turkey after his military victory, and thus he made his military success official in the political arena.

4.3.2. The Moscow Treaty of Friendship

Ankara and Soviet governments could not reach a written agreement despite of creating mutual confidence and cooperations. While the necessary assistance was coming from the Soviet Russia, the Ankara Government suggested to the Soviets to convene a Turkish-Soviet conference in Baku. The Soviet Government acknowledged the call, but announced that the conference should be held in Moscow. Ankara accepted the proposal of the Soviets. A delegation under the presidency of Yusuf kemal Bey, including Dr. Rıza Nur Bey, Memduh Şevket (Esental) Bey and

⁸²⁷ Tansel, *Ibid.*, Vol. III, pp. 229-230; İnan, *Ibid.*, p. 78; Atatürk, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 333.

⁸²⁸ Tansel, *Ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 230; Yalçın...[et al.]; *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 223; Keskin...[et al.]; *Ibid.*, p. 114.

Saffet Bey, was appointed to attend the conference in Moscow. Ambassador of Turkey in Moscow, Ali Fuat Pasha also participated in delegation on the road. On behalf of the GNA of Turkey, the delegation was granted the authority to negotiate and sign agreements on matters related to peace and solidarity such as political, military and defense issues among the Islamic governments of Soviet Russia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Caucasus, Dagestan and Central Asia.⁸²⁹

Turkish delegation departed from Kars on January 29, 1921, and arrived in Moscow on February 19, 1921, via Tbilisi and Baku. The Turkish delegation was welcomed with a military ceremony. Towards evening at 17:00, Yusuf Kemal Bey, Counselor Saffet Bey and Seyfi Bey visited the Soviet Foreign Minister Chicherin and his assistant Karahan. The next day, Ali Fuat Pasha, who gave his letter of credence to Chicherin, thanked the Soviet Government for the friendly acceptance of the Turkish delegation in both Moscow and the Soviet territory along the way.⁸³⁰ Informal negotiations between the Turkish delegation and Chicherin began on February 21, 1921. The main themes of these talks were the evacuation of Turkish troops from Armenia and Georgia and the fifth provision of the Treaty of Gümrü. According to this article, when the external or internal danger was concerned, the Turkish Government was supposed to provide military assistance to Armenia. Turkish delegates made a lot of effort to prove that this article of the treaty was against the imperialist countries, not against Soviet Russia.⁸³¹

After informal talks, the Turkish-Soviet Conference officially opened on February 26, 1921. Chicherin delivered a speech in the conference and put emphasis on the distinguished role of the Soviet people in the fight against imperialism. Also, he declared that the people, who fought for their freedom, and meanwhile Turkish people, were a natural ally of Soviet Russia. He expressed that the friendship, combining both countries, should develop in the interests of all peoples fighting imperialism and in line with the common interests of Russia and Turkey.⁸³² After the

⁸²⁹ Yusuf Kemal Tengirşenk, *Vatan Hizmetinde*, (İstanbul: Bahar Matbaası, 1967), pp. 199-202; Gürün, *Ibid.*, p. 64.

⁸³⁰ Tengirşenk, *Ibid.*, p. 215; Cebesoy, *Moskova Hatıraları*, p. 137.

⁸³¹ Cebesoy, *Moskova Hatıraları*, p. 138.

⁸³² A note of Chicherin was published in *Hâkimiyet-i Milliye*. In this note, Chicherin pointed out that Turkey should be celebrated because of the success it had shown until this day, and he expressed his

speech of Chicherin, Yusuf Kemal Bey expressed his thanks for the warm welcome shown. Then, he continued his speech as follows:

These two people naturally walk together. The historical process forces these two people to walk hand in hand. Turkey entered the right way. All conditions show him the way to Russia... There are two people who do not want to submit to the domination of capitalism. These two forces must act together.⁸³³

Three committees, including policy, law and redaction, were formed for the preparation of the draft of the treaty in the conference. At the Commission sessions, border issues, wars of independence, trade and economic problems and Black Sea and Straits issues were discussed in detail.

A while ago, Soviet Russia had refrained from forming a mutual military alliance with Ankara because they expressed their doubts that the Turks were trying to compromise with the French in London and they put forward that they had tried to conclude a Soviet-British trade agreement. Depending on this agreement, Soviets promised Britain not to give support non-Communist countries.⁸³⁴ However, the parts of the changes in the international environment were reversals in Soviet relations with the West: the military reversal in the Polish war, and the disruption of the British-Soviet trade negotiations in London. Others were certain changes in the Allied policy toward Ankara. Allies tried to seek compromise instead of military confrontation. Accordingly, the tangible international achievements of the Ankara Government in Gümrü and İnönü paved the way of getting its delegation invited to the London Conference held between February 21 - March 12, 1921, separately from the Ottoman delegation. This situation gave the Ankara Government relatively more bargaining power. In this occasion, there was no meaning to loose the Nationalists to the West and the Soviets had to change their attitude towards Ankara.⁸³⁵

satisfaction due to infroming of the two governments each other about recent events and circumstances. It was also written that the Soviet administration asked England to recognize the independence and territorial integrity of Iran, Afghanistan and the Government of Ankara. *Hâkimiyet-i Milliye*, No.112, 18 Şubat 1337 [18.02.1921], p. 1.

⁸³³ Şamsutdinov, *Ibid.*, p. 205.

⁸³⁴ Tengirşenk, *Ibid.*, pp. 216-218; Cebesoy, *Moskova Hatıraları*, p. 141.

⁸³⁵ Halil İbrahim Karal, *Turkish Relations With Soviet Russia During The National Liberation War of Turkey, 1918-1922*, (Los Angeles: University of California, 1967), pp. 231-233; Cebesoy, *Moskova Hatıraları*, p. 142.

In the meantime, the negotiations between Moscow and Ankara were followed by the press carefully. As Yusuf Kemal Bey reported to Ankara, the Bolsheviks were suspicious of the attitude of Bekir Sami Bey, the president of the Turkish delegation who attended the London Conference. In order to appease their suspicions, Mustafa Kemal gave a statement to *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* on February 6, 1921. Mustafa Kemal explained that the Turkish delegation, which would attend at the conference held in Moscow, was about to reach Moscow and he expressed his hope that all Caucasian problems would be solved absolutely according to the interests of the Turkish nation. Moreover, he said that taking part of Turkey into the London Conference would not definitely cause the deterioration of friendly relations with Russia.⁸³⁶

Another Anatolian newspaper *Anadolu'da Yeni Gün* compared London and Moscow conferences with an editorial and the newspaper said “while we follow the negotiations of the London Conference with despair, we watch the sessions of the Moscow Conference with hope.” The editorial, which reminded that Soviet Russia and Turkey were in the same situation against the Western imperialists, asserted that Eastern nations would gain such success if they united and defended their interests in a relatively strong way against Western oppression. The newspaper, referring to the fact that Soviet Russia should keep its friendship with the Turks separate from the internal politics of Turkey, explained the connection of this with the Turkish-Soviet relations as follows:

...The friendship that we try to establish with the Russians requires neither their abandonment of Bolshevism nor our being Bolsheviks... Therefore, we would like to evaluate these two issues separately. In order for the ongoing negotiations in Moscow to provide beneficial and fortunate results for both nations, it is necessary for both sides to deal with issues in this respect and manage the negotiations in this feeling...⁸³⁷

After Mustafa Kemal's explanation, Soviets could comprehend that Mustafa Kemal Pasha and the Government of Ankara were sincere in their struggle against the imperialists. Also, they evaluated the London Conference as a political trick to undermine the Soviet-Turk relations. In a report from the Russian press, London and

⁸³⁶ *Hâkimiyet-i Milliye*, No.101, 6 Şubat 1337 [06.02.1921], p. 1.

⁸³⁷ *Anadolu'da Yeni Gün*, No.554-175, 13 Mart 1337 [13.03.1921], p. 1.

Moscow conferences were compared. In the news, it was dwelled that after Mustafa Kemal Pasha taught a painful lesson to the Greeks, the Entente Powers gathered a conference in London. The newspaper claimed that this conference aimed to use Mustafa Kemal against Soviet Russia by preventing the Turkish-Soviet reconciliation as well as making changes in Greek demands. The editorial emphasized that this could not be accomplished, because it could not be possible to make an agreement for Turkey, being pillaged, with the Western capitalist countries, looting Turkey. According to the newspaper Soviet newspaper, the actual representative of Turkey was the Ankara Government, headed by Mustafa Kemal, not İstanbul Government, which had become plaything the hands of the imperialists.⁸³⁸

As a result, at the end of the negotiations held on March 9, 1921, the basis of the Moscow Treaty of Friendship was determined and the agreement was signed by Chicherin and Yusuf Kemal Bey on March 18, 1921. However, with the consent of both sides, this date had been changed to March 16, 1921, the anniversary of the official occupation of İstanbul. The Moscow Treaty of Friendship consisted of a preamble, sixteen articles and three attached document.⁸³⁹

The content of the treaty was as follows: The two sides would not recognize any peace treaty enforced to each other by the outside. The Soviet administration would not recognize any agreement challenging the borders determined in the National Pact. Batum would be left to the administration of Georgia and its people would be given autonomy. Nahcivan would be given local autonomy under the protection of Azerbaijan. The two sides would recognize the freedom and independence of the Eastern nations. The clause on the Turkish Straits accepted the Soviet thesis that the status of the Straits should be determined by the littoral Black Sea states, by recognizing Turkish sovereignty.⁸⁴⁰ The agreements signed between the two countries until that date, which were not in the common interests, shall be null and

⁸³⁸ *Anadolu'da Yeni Gün*, No.595-215, 28 Nisan 1337 [28.04.1921], p. 2. From *Izvestia*. For the similar news, See *Açıksöz*, March 16, 1921, p. 1. Kazım Karabekir also evaluated the London Conference as political game against the relations of Soviet-Turk and he warned the GNA about this issue. See Karabekir, *İstiklal Harbimiz*, Vol. IV, p. 1969.

⁸³⁹ Karal, *Turkish Relations With Soviet Russia*, p. 255; Gürün, *Ibid.*, p. 68; Cebesoy, *Moskova Hatıraları*, p. 150; Atabay, *Milli Mücadele Tarihi*, p. 215.

⁸⁴⁰ The National Pact had stated that the regime of the Straits could be determined by "interested states."

void. The Soviets would not recognize the Capitulations. In addition, in an official letter sent to Yusuf Kemal Bey, Chicherin had promised that Soviet Russia would send financial assistance amounting to 10 million rubles every year for economic development of Turkey.⁸⁴¹

The Moscow Treaty of Friendship was adopted on July 7, 1921, with the approval of the GNA of Turkey. Turkey was gaining a great diplomatic victory with this treaty. The national goals, as embodied in the National Pact, as regards territorial integrity were recognized to some extent and secured the eastern borders. The abolition of Capitulations was explicitly approved. With this treaty, the Ankara Government was breaking out of its more than year long isolation. Moreover, the GNA was being recognized as the sole representative of Turkey as regards all international contracts for the first time. Turkey provided solutions to some conflicts of the satellite states in the Caucasus with the help of Moscow. Soviet Russia, on the other hand, gained a new friend against the Entente Powers, and strengthened its own position and influence in the Islamic countries of the Caucasus and the East. In addition, the possibility of revolt in Azerbaijan and the North Caucasus against the Soviets was removed.⁸⁴²

At the time of the Turkish-Soviet Conference in Moscow, Russians demanded the participation of representatives of Georgia, Azerbaijan and Armenia in the negotiations, but the Turkish delegation opposed it. For this reason, it was determined that a separate agreement with the Caucasian republics would be concluded in the future. In addition, the Soviet administration would assume a kind of intermediary role in adopting of the same provisions of the Moscow Treaty of Friendship by the Republics of the Caucasus. On September 26, 1921, the Kars Conference was held with the participation of representatives of Russia, Azerbaijan, Georgia and Armenia. The Turkish representative was Kazım Karabekir Pasha.⁸⁴³

⁸⁴¹ İsmail Soysal, *Tarihçeleri ve Açıklamaları ile Birlikte Türkiye'nin Siyasal Andlaşmaları*, Vol. I, (1920-1945), (Ankara: TTK, 1983), p. 33-38; Tengirşenk, *Ibid.*, pp. 237-242; *Hâkimiyet-i Milliye*, No.142, 25 Mart 1337 [25.03.1921], p. 1.

⁸⁴² Salahi R. Sonyel, "Kurtuluş Savaşı Günlerinde Doğu Siyasamız" *Bellekten*, Vol. XLI, No. 164 (1977), pp. 716-717; Karal, *Turkish Relations With Soviet Russia...*, p. 256; Atabay, *Milli Mücadele Tarihi*, p. 216.

⁸⁴³ For the details of the conference, See Karabekir, *İstiklal Harbimiz*, Vol. IV, pp. 2092-2118.

After the negotiations, the Treaty of Kars was signed with the related states on October 13, 1921, following the Battle of Sakarya. The articles of the Kars Treaty were same with the provisions of the Moscow Treaty.⁸⁴⁴ With the Treaty of Kars, Armenian question, which was actually shaped by the political and economic interests of the imperialist powers rather than the interests of the the Armenian nation, was resolved in terms of Turkey.⁸⁴⁵ However, despite the ratification of remise their territorial demands from Turkey with this treaty; Armenians brought their territorial requests from Turkey on the agenda again at Lausanne. Since the Soviet Russia had sovietized Armenia, there was no independent Armenian Republic at that time. Moreover, Soviet Russia did not take step to support the Armenian requests.⁸⁴⁶

4.3.3. The Treaty of Ankara with France

The repulse of the Greeks at Sakarya strengthened the ineternational position of Ankara Government. France, which had attempted to negotiate directly with the Ankara conference in London in February-March 1921, pursued to clinch the relations with Ankara. French had already opposed the Greek offensive since the beginning because they enjoyed confortable financial and cultural assets in Anatolia, with which the extension of Greek rule into Anstolia might interfere. Moreover, they were jealous of British political power in the Middle East, and considered the British support of the Greeks as a design to make it permanent. French also saw that the Allies would not be able to enforce drastic peace conditions on Turkey which resisted to it. In addition, according to French, the Greeks would not be able to enforce peace terms without aid of Allies which had no intent to grant.⁸⁴⁷

As for Ankara, the National Government, as mentioned before, had concluded the Moscow Treaty of Friendship with Russia and the situation in the East had been

⁸⁴⁴ Gürün, *Ibid.*, p. 70-71; Karabekir, *İstiklal Harbimiz*, Vol. IV, pp. 2119-2120.

⁸⁴⁵ Yalçın...[et al.]; *Ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 226-227.

⁸⁴⁶ Gürün, *Ibid.*, p. 71.

⁸⁴⁷ Ömer Budak, "Milli Mücadele Dönemi Türk-Fransız İlişkileri", *Karadeniz Araştırmaları*, No. 19 (2008), p. 111; Toynbee, *Ibid.*, p. 17; Kinross, *Ibid.*, p. 284.

made clearer. Now, Ankara thought that making agreement with the Allied powers that seemed to be inclined to respect the national principles of Turkey would be able to conclude. Furthermore, the Government attached special importance to the liberation of the districts of Adana, Antep and surroundings from foreign occupation. The French, who occupied Turkish provinces as well as Syria, had also tendency to make deal with Ankara for various reasons.⁸⁴⁸ Therefore, both sides made attempt to get into touch with another. In June 1921, France sent Franklin Bouillon as a semi-official representative to Ankara to negotiate between the two countries and he arrived at Ankara on June 9, 1921.⁸⁴⁹

Mustafa Kemal Pasha negotiated with Franklin Bouillon himself in the presence of Fevzi Pasha and Yusuf Kemal Bey, the Minister of Foreign Affairs. In the meeting, Mustafa Kemal Pasha put forward that the point of view was based on the principles which determined by the National Pact. However, Bouillon remarked that the agreement that had been made in London between Bekir Sami and M. Briand should be the basis of the negotiations and the provisions which were in contradiction to the National Pact should be discussed. To support his proposal, he asserted that the Turkish delegates had not spoken about the National Pact in London, and moreover, that nobody in Europe or even in İstanbul had yet sufficiently grasped the sense and real bearing of the Pact and the national movement.⁸⁵⁰ Mustafa Kemal Pasha replied that the leader of Turkish delegation, Bekir Sami Bey, had made himself guilty of a mistake by not acting in accordance with the instructions and within the authority which the GNA of Turkey gave. Moreover, refuted the claims of Bouillon and he said it is impossible that Europe was ignorant about the National Pact. Additionally, Mustafa Kemal emphasized that there was no truth in the assertion that İstanbul knew nothing about the National Pact and national movement. The population of İstanbul with the whole of the Turkish nation was fully informed and completely approved these struggles. Then, Franklin Bouillon finally suggested that the

⁸⁴⁸ Atatürk, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 421.

⁸⁴⁹ Aybars, *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Tarihi*, p. 291; Toynbee, *Ibid.*, p. 17.

⁸⁵⁰ Bige Yavuz, *Kurtuluş Savaşı Döneminde Türk-Fransız İlişkileri: Fransız Arşiv Belgeleri Açısından 1919-1922*, (Ankara: TTK, 1994), p. 135; Budak, *Ibid.*, p. 112; Atatürk, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 421- 422.

discussion should be delayed so that he could read the National Pact and understand its meaning.⁸⁵¹

After the Battle of Sakarya, the negotiations between Mustafa Kemal Pasha and Franklin Bouillon started on September 24, 1921. In the negotiations with Bouillon, the only thing that the Ankara Government expected was full independence in terms of political, economic, legal, military and cultural aspects. Mustafa Kemal Pasha and Bouillon carried on exchange of views on a number of questions for days. Eventually, Mustafa Kemal Pasha and Franklin Bouillon together came to a conclusion and the Treaty of Ankara was signed between Yusuf Kemal Bey and Franklin Bouillon on October 20, 1921, after the great Battle of Sakarya.⁸⁵²

The nationalist newspaper, *Tasvir-i Efkar* printed in İstanbul Newspaper announced the news with the title “There is no Zone of Influence in the Treaty of Turkey-France.” “The newspaper narrated the terms of the agreement as follows: With the treaty, France agreed the revision to on the border. The current border will follow the Baghdad Railway up to Nusaybin. Cilicia will be evacuated. The method of zone of influence that the Turks are not satisfied with will be abolished.”⁸⁵³ *Vakit* announced Ankara Treaty under the title of “the Terms of the Turk-French Agreement.” According to the newspaper, “this treaty allowed for the evacuation of Cilicia, an adjustment of frontiers to Turkey’s advantage between Cilicia and Syria, and the establishment of a special regime in İskenderun (Hatay) to safeguard the interests of the Turkish population. In fact, the Treaty of Ankara was the one of the turning points in the period of the National Struggle.”⁸⁵⁴

Mustafa Kemal Pasha expressed the importance of the treaty as follows: “Thanks to this treaty, valuable parts of Anatolia were freed from occupation without the slightest measure of country’s independence in political, economic and military regard being sacrificed.”⁸⁵⁵ In addition, the Ankara Government obtained an

⁸⁵¹ Yavuz, *Ibid.*, pp. 135-136; Atatürk, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 421- 422.

⁸⁵² Aybars, *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Tarihi*, p. 291.

⁸⁵³ *Tasvir-i Efkar*, No.3163-135, 24 Teşrin-i Evvel 1337 [23.10.1921.], p. 1.

⁸⁵⁴ Budak, *Ibid.*, p. 112; Yavuz, *Ibid.*, p. 145; Aybars, *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Tarihi*, pp. 291-293. For the whole provisions of the treaty, See Yavuz, *Ibid.*, pp. 145-148; Budak, *Ibid.*, pp. 112-113.

⁸⁵⁵ Atatürk, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 424.

important diplomatic success. The national movement and legitimacy were for the first time admitted by a Western Power.⁸⁵⁶ In this way, the Ankara Government ensured the southern frontiers and could send the Turkish troops to reinforce the Western Front.

As for the news about the Treaty of Ankara, *Açıksöz* published news about the treaty in its issue dated as October 23, 1921. The newspaper, stating that anything about the terms of the treaty were not yet known, suggested that this agreement emerged without renouncing of “the National Pact”, which indicated the minimum demands of a nation that wanted to live. In addition to this, the newspaper emphasized that it was not possible not to comprise for a nation desiring “I will live!” with a nation stating “live!”. The editorial, briefly referring to the history of Turkish-French relations, pointed out that it was not Franklin’s pen, but the clean bayonet of the Turk to crumble the Treaty of Sevres, described as an “British monument”. Moreover, the newspaper made interesting evaluations about political disagreements of France and Britain in the Near East. “The British crowned Emir Faysal, who French expelled from Syria, the king of Iraq. Now, according to a telegram, French will crown Hidiv Abbas Pasha, who the Britain expelled from Egypt, the king of Syria.”⁸⁵⁷

Akşam also published news about the Treaty of Ankara on October 24, 1921. The newspaper wrote that “the first peace after seven years of war was made with France.” *Akşam* gave importance to the treaty and it said that “at this moment when we still bleed for freedom and independence, the first friendly hand reaching out to us was the hand of free and great France.”⁸⁵⁸

Açıksöz published again an editorial evaluating the terms of the Treaty of Ankara in the issue of November 7, 1921. According to the editorial published after the terms of the agreement became clear, the Treaty of Ankara was “local”; that is, it solved only problems with France. In addition to these, some general problems were also mentioned. This treaty was the declaration that the Treaty of Sevres had officially begun to remove. “As mentioned in the newspaper, as one of the general issues,

⁸⁵⁶ Aybars, *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Tarihi*, p. 293; Yavuz, *Ibid.*, p. 148; Budak, *Ibid.*, p. 112; Kinross, *Ibid.*, p. 285.

⁸⁵⁷ *Açıksöz*, No.316, 23 Teşrin-i Evvel 1337 [23.10.1921], p. 1.

⁸⁵⁸ *Akşam*, No.1108, 24 Teşrin-i Evvel 1337 [24.11.1921], p.1.

“Capitulations” had never referred in the treaty. But there was no provision in the treaty that the Capitulations would be valid. According to the editorial, this meant that France had implicitly confirmed the removal of it. France would also abandon not only the places that had occupied before but also the territory that had been left itself in the name of the “zone of influence”. Moreover, the editorial, as related to territorial gains and the southern borders of Turkey referred that the Baghdad railway was left to Turkey with all the stations. With this treaty, the special status was given to İskenderun and the problems of the lea and pasture of the nomadic tribes in the border region were resolved. The newspaper, relayed that Turkey regained France, “which had been lost for a long time” with the Treaty of Ankara. The news ended with the important comment: “When a foreign newspaper talked about this issue, it said that the Treaty of Ankara shook the status quo of the Greece much more than the Battle of Sakarya.”⁸⁵⁹

In an article, published in *Vakit* by taking from French press, it was reminded that a two-month-duration, appointed with the Treaty of Ankara for the evacuation of Cilicia, was completed on January 5, 1921. The newspaper stated that the French troops had evacuated the territory mentioned in the meantime and it added the following statements: “It was claimed that the evacuation of Cilicia by French would lead to the massacre in the region, and even an attempt was made to raise concerns about it. However, France kept its promise, and no one was killed or injured.” In the article, it was displayed that during the evacuation of the occupied region, 49. 712 Christians migrated and 3828 people remained in the country. According to the report, it was verified that the population was not 300,000, as previously predicted, and it was only 53,712.⁸⁶⁰

A report evaluating the Ankara Treaty from the point of view of the British was published in *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*. According to the news from French newspaper *Le Matin*, it was suggested that the British were against the Turkish-French agreement and that it would not be possible for the Britain to recognize this agreement. The newspapers pointed out the points the Britain objected:

⁸⁵⁹ *Açıksöz*, No.329, 7 Teşrin-i Sani 1337 [07.11.1921], p. 1.

⁸⁶⁰ *Vakit*, No.1469, 11 Kanun-i Sani 1338 [11.01.1922], p. 2. From *Le Temps*.

The land of Syria is closely related to us. You (the French) are obliged to the land (Syria) that is given to you by a mandate whose administration has not been approved by the League of Nations. This treaty - in contradiction to the Briand-Bekir Sami Treaty signed in London in March 1921 – leaves the Turks some of the land where Baghdad railway passes. This is always a threat to Europe. We want to be enlightened about the letter written by Franklin Bouillon to Yusuf Kemal.⁸⁶¹

Britain instructed its ambassador to publish a memorandum in French press and this memorandum was published in French newspaper *Le Matin*. Another French newspaper, *Le Temps*, responded to this memorandum with a long editorial and this editorial was published in the form of full translation in *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* on November 28, 1921. The French responded to the British memorandum as follows: “The British claimed that the British Government had no objection to the Briand-Bekir Sami Agreement signed on March 11, 1921. However, Lord Curzon asserted that the Briand-Bekir Sami Agreement was incompatible with the treaties signed by its Allies and that France tried to gain special interests. Later, when the British Government saw the text of the aforementioned agreement, it did not protest France because of this deal. In this case, the Britain agreed to the agreement made in March. Already, the Treaty of Ankara was composed of Briand-Bekir Sami Agreement with additional items to this treaty. The Treaty of Ankara declared that the war between France and Turkey ended and that the peace between the governments of France and Turkey was signed. Also, France approved the Ankara Government as the sole competent government of Turkey.

As it was criticized in the memorandum, England was opposed to negotiations with Turkish nationalists. But it was the British Government that invited Bekir Sami Bey to London. Ankara delegation was present at the London Conference in March, 1921, as the representatives of the sole authorized government in Turkey. The British Government also made negotiations with the representatives of the national government for mutual release of prisoners.

The other objection in the note offered by England was related to the Turkey-Syria border. On that point, the French newspaper attracted notice that the Undersecretary of the British Ministry of Foreign Affairs did not have any objectionable clauses regarding the border in his speech delivered in the House of Commons on 8th

⁸⁶¹ *Hâkimiyet-i Milliye*, No.361, 24 Teşrin-i Sani 1337 [24.11.1921], p. 1. From *Le Matin*.

November 1921. On the contrary, it was expressed that British trade would not be harmed by this border regulation:

The land extending across the entire northern border of Syria, which is left to the Turkish control and which should not be left under Turkish control according to the provisions of the Treaty of Sevres, consists of a part of the territory in which does not include the region of the British commercial interests.⁸⁶²

In addition, Britain was opposed to Turkish use of railways for military transport. The underlying reason for this was to protect Emir Faisal, who had been placed on the northern border of Syria, and Emir Abdullah, who had been put on the southern border of Syria by Britain, from any possible threat of other states. For this reason, the French had to stand on the border of northern Syria with all their forces against the Turks.

Another point that Britain criticized was that France recognized the independence and sovereignty of Turkey and obtained some privileges by his recognition. French newspaper put forward that the long-standing policy of France had aimed to sustain the independence and sovereignty of Turkey and it is required that this policy or attitude should not be attributed to achieve privileges in any way from Turkey. And also, France did not need these things anyway. Moreover, the section of “permissions and privileges” in the Treaty of Ankara was no different from the section of “permissions and previliges” in the Briand-Bekir Sami Agreement signed on March 11, 1921. Even, it is renounced and refrained entirely from determining and accepting the zone of influence, which means the partition of Turkey.’’⁸⁶³

Hakimiyet-i Milliye in the issue dated as December 1, 1921, handled the memorandum of the British Ambassador to Paris, Lord Harding, sending to the French Government. The article from the French newspaper *Journal de Debats* compared and evaluated the Treaty of Ankara with the Briand-Bekir Sami Treaty of March 11, 1921. The article referred to the fact that a part of the British press, which evaluated the note of Lord Harding, contained violent objections and indictments that are relevant to the Turkish-French Treaty. In fact, the news argued that the Treaty of Ankara basically did not differ much from the agreement signed by Bekir Sami Bey

⁸⁶² *Hâkimiyet-i Milliye*, No.364, 28 Teşrin-i Sani 1337 [28.11.1921], p. 1. From *Le Temps*.

⁸⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 1. From *Le Temps*.

but not approved by the Assembly in Ankara. Also, the article attributed the confirmation of the Treaty of Ankara by the GNA of Turkey to “finding it acceptable for Turkish interests” because, it could be easily discovered that this treaty was in favor of Turkey if the provisions of this treaty had been examined one by one. Besides, according to the news, Britain blamed France for establishing relations with the Nationalists; however, it (Britain) had done evils against France with together the Kemalists for three years. The politics of Britain, based on the material and moral support of the Government of Greece, now turned against the general interests of Greece and the Allies. France, on the other hand, stood against “the mad adventure” of Greece in Anatolia with all the strength. According to the newspaper, the French Foreign Ministry responded to this policy of the Britain by signing the Treaty of Ankara.⁸⁶⁴

4.3.4. Legal Recognition: Mudanya Conference and Armistice

Within one year after the Battle of Sakarya, the Turkish army started to be strengthened with military equipments in order to increase the assault force of the army. On March 4, 1922, Mustafa Kemal Pasha made certain statements related to preparations offensive at a secret meeting of the GNA of Turkey. He explained the situation as follows:

The army is determined to attack, but we still postpone this offensive because we still require much more time to complete our preparations. Launching an offensive, depended upon half measures and only partial preparation, is worse than not to attack at all. It is groundless to explain or interpret our waiting by saying that we had abandoned our decision to attack or that we were doubtful whether we would be able to achieve this attack.⁸⁶⁵

While the preparations were carefully carried for great offensive, the Ankara Government thought it beneficial to learn the attitude and position of the foreign spectators about the Nationalists. For this purpose, the Government sent Yusuf Kemal Bey, Minister of Foreign Affairs, to Europe in February 1922, and sent Fethi Bey,

⁸⁶⁴ *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, No.367, 1 Kanun-i Evvel 1337 [01.12.1921], p. 1. From *Journal des Debats*.

⁸⁶⁵ Atatürk, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 431; Göze, *Ibid.*, p. 161.

Minister of the Interior in July.⁸⁶⁶ Interviews of Yusuf Kemal Bey in Paris and London did not produce any result. As it was understood that the Foreign Ministers of Allied powers would meet at a Conference and they would make peace proposals to the Nationalists. However, Allies agreed to evacuate Anatolia in principle, before this, they asked that the Ankara Government should conclude an armistice with the Greeks in case of resuming the war during the negotiations at the Conference. Indeed, Yusuf Kemal Bey was on the road, the proposals of the Foreign Ministers of Allied Powers for armistice reached to the Turkish and Greek Governments on March 22, 1922. For armistice, the Allied Powers proposed the conditions that contained different kinds of terms existed in the Treaty of Sevres.⁸⁶⁷ The Ankara Government put forward the evacuation of Anatolia on April 22, 1922 by the Greeks, but they did not accept these proposals.⁸⁶⁸

Meanwhile, the needs and deficiencies of the army were about to be completed. Mustafa Kemal Pasha, in the middle of June 1922, took the decision to attack and he kept this decision like a secret. Only three people knew this: Chief of General Staff Fevzi Pasha, Western Front Commander İsmet Pasha and Minister of National Defense Kazım Pasha. On August 6, 1922, İsmet Pasha gave the armies secret command to be ready for attack. On August 20, 1922, Mustafa Kemal left for Konya by motor-car and he crossed to Akşehir, where the Headquarters of the Western Front located in. On August 25, it was decided to transfer the headquarters from Akşehir to south-west of Kocatepe. The military operation was conducted by Mustafa Kemal Pasha at Kocatepe.⁸⁶⁹

The attack of the Turkish army started with the artillery in morning of August 26, 1922. In two days, the Turkish army took the fortified fronts of the enemy, which included the area south and east of Afyonkarahisar. On August 30, 1922, the Turkish army surrounded all forces of the enemy in the around of Aslıhanlar and Turkish forces defeated the main forces of the enemy and took many prisoners, including General Trikopis, commander-in-chief of the enemy's army. The Turkish forces

⁸⁶⁶ E. Semih Yalçın, *Atatürk'ün Milli Dış Siyaseti*, (Ankara: Berikan Yayınevi, 2010), pp. 111, 132.

⁸⁶⁷ Yalçın...[et al.]; *Ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 303-304; Price, *Ibid.*, p. 203; Atatürk, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 437-438. For the terms of the armistice, See *Hâkimiyet-i Milliye*, No.142, 25 Mart 1338 [25.03.1922], p. 1.

⁸⁶⁸ Yalçın, *Atatürk'ün Milli Dış...*, pp. 131-132.

⁸⁶⁹ Göze, *Ibid.*, pp. 169-170; Yalçın...[et al.]; *Ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 307-308.

continued to advance towards the direction of İzmir and defeated the enemy's forces in north of Eskişehir.⁸⁷⁰ On September 1, 1922, Mustafa Kemal Pasha published a declaration, saying that *Armies! Your first destination is the Mediterranean. March!*⁸⁷¹ Eventually, the newspapers announced the good news that Turkish forces saved İzmir on September 9, 1922, and Bursa on September 11, 1922, from the enemy occupation.⁸⁷² Mustafa Kemal Pasha issued a communique upon the recapture of İzmir by the Turkish army. Mustafa Kemal said that: “The destination of Mediterranean was reached. I have full faith that our soldiers would always show the same eager self-sacrifice.”⁸⁷³ *Akşam* also reported the recapture of Bursa and the destruction of the Greek army: “Our troops entered Bursa yesterday night. The Greeks have burned Mudanya and Gemlik.”⁸⁷⁴ *İleri* announced the salvation of İzmir as follow: “İzmir was captured by the troops under the command of Mürsel Pasha 11:30 am yesterday forenoon.”⁸⁷⁵ The newspaper reported the retaking of Bursa from the Greeks: “Thank to God for thousands times, our lovely Bursa was saved as well.”⁸⁷⁶ *Tasvir-i Efkâr* announced the retaking of İzmir as follows: “Praise and thank to God that our glorious army rescued İzmir yesterday.”⁸⁷⁷ The same newspaper was also pleased with the salvation of Bursa. The paper reported that “our savior national army saved also Bursa, which had been cradle of our independence and the first capital.”⁸⁷⁸ *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* gave coverage to the important news evaluating the consequences of the Greek defeat with the following statements:

It is not one but two who are defeated in Anatolia. One of them is Constantine, the Greek Commander-in-Chief, and the other is Lloyd George, the Prime Minister of

⁸⁷⁰ Göze, *Ibid.*, pp. 170-171; İnönü, *Ibid.*, pp. 274-278; Eroğlu, *Ibid.*, p. 255.

⁸⁷¹ *Hâkimiyet-i Milliye*, No.596, 2 Eylül 1338 [02.09.1922], p. 1.

⁸⁷² *Akşam*, No.1424, 10 Eylül 1338 [10.09.1922], p. 1; *Akşam*, No.1426, 12 Eylül 1338 [12.09.1922], p. 1. For detailed information, See Yalçın...[et al.]; *Ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 311-314; İnönü, *Ibid.*, p. 285; Toynebee, *Ibid.*, p. 20.

⁸⁷³ *Akşam*, No.1426, 12 Eylül 1338 [12.09.1922], p. 1. For the same declaration, See *Anadolu'da Yeni Gün*, No.968-591, 12 Eylül 1338 [12.09.1922], p. 1

⁸⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 1.

⁸⁷⁵ *İleri*, No.1652, 11 Eylül 1338 [11.09.1922], p. 1.

⁸⁷⁶ *İleri*, No.1653, 12 Eylül 1338 [12.09.1922], p. 1. For the same news, See *Anadolu'da Yeni Gün*, No.968-591, 12 Eylül 1338 [12.09.1922], p. 1.

⁸⁷⁷ *Tasvir-i Efkâr*, No.3478-450, 10 Eylül 1338 [10.09.1922], p. 1; *Anadolu'da Yeni Gün*, No.966-589, 10 Eylül 1338 [10.09.1922], p. 1.

⁸⁷⁸ *Tasvir-i Efkâr*, No.3481-453, 12 Eylül 1338 [12.09.1922], p. 1.

England. Unless the British Pasha (L. George) had encouraged the ambition of the Vice King Constantine, perhaps the situation would not take this form.⁸⁷⁹

After the retaking of İzmir and Bursa, the Turkish forces continued their advances to İstanbul and Çakkale with the object of releasing Thrace from the hands of the Greeks. In the meantime, General Pelle, the High Commissioner of France in İstanbul, went to İzmir for the purpose of interviewing Mustafa Kemal Pasha. Franklin Bouillon also sent a telegram to Mustafa Kemal Pasha, expressing his desire of interviewing with Mustafa Kemal. He came to İzmir and they started to negotiate about the situation. In the course of negotiations with Bouillon, the Foreign Ministers of the Allied powers sent a Note dated on September 23, 1922. The Note was related to the cessation of hostility and the Peace Conference.⁸⁸⁰ Moreover, before the Peace Conference the Allied powers proposed to hold a meeting at Mudanya or İzmit in order to deal with the problems. On September 29, 1922, Mustafa Kemal Pasha replied that he accepted the proposal of a conference at Mudanya. He additionally asked that Thrace as far as Meriç should be immediately given back to Turkey.⁸⁸¹

The press also followed the Mudanya Conference and published news about developments related to the conference. *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* reported that the conference was held on October 3, 1922 and the representative of Turkey was İsmet Pasha. Also, General Harrington from Britain, General Charpy from France and General Monbelli from Italy were present at the Conference.⁸⁸² *Tasvir-i Efkâr* wrote about this issue: The Mudanya Conference that would bring together our Thrace with the crescent would convene today. The newspaper also announced before the Conference that it had been decided on that Thrace would be given back immediately back.⁸⁸³ After violent discussions lasted for a week, the Mudanya Armistice was signed by those representatives on October 11, 1922. *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* published all terms of the Mudanya Armistice in issue of October 12, 1922. As a consequence, the armed conflict between Turkey and Greece ended with the armistice.

⁸⁷⁹ *Hâkimiyet-i Milliye*, No.608, 14 Eylül 1338 [14.09.1922], p. 1.

⁸⁸⁰ Atatürk, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 459-460; Yalçın, *Atatürk'ün Milli Dış...*, p. 136; Göze, *Ibid.*, p. 290.

⁸⁸¹ Taner Baytok, *İngiliz Belgeleriyle Sevr'den Lozan'a: Dünden Bugüne Değişen Ne Var?*, (İstanbul: Doğan Kitap, 2007), p. 193-195; Atatürk, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 460; İnönü, *Ibid.*, p. 295-298.

⁸⁸² *Hâkimiyet-i Milliye*, No.624, 3 Teşrin-i Evvel 1338 [03.10.1922], p. 1. Also See *İleri*, No.1673, 3 Teşrin-i Evvel 1338 [03.10.1922], p. 1; *Akşam*, No.1447, 03 Teşrin-i Evvel 1338 [03.10.1922], p. 1; *Vakit*, No.1726, 3 Teşrin-i Evvel 1338 [03.10.1922], p. 1.

⁸⁸³ *Tasvir-i Efkâr*, No.3501-473, 3 Teşrin-i Evvel 1338 [03.10.1922], p. 1.

Tasvir-i Efkar reported the news of the signing of the Mudanya Armistice on October 11, 1922, with the following statements: “The salvation and returning of Thrace and Edirne became certain by the Mudanya Armistice signed yesterday morning at 6:30.” The newspaper also mentioned that the Greek representatives did not sign the armistice; however, avoidance of the Greeks to sign the armistice did not have any importance.⁸⁸⁴ According to *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, with the Mudanya Armistice, the Allies agreed to evacuate the Greeks from Eastern Thrace immediately, and to return it to the Turkish civil administration up to the Meriç River within a period of thirty days after the Greek evacuation. They also admitted that Turks could have a force of 8,000 gendarmes in the region for security. Moreover, it was determined that Turkey and Allied powers would not carry out military operation in the region of the Straits of Çanakkale and İstanbul. The Armistice of Mudanya would come into force in three days after it was signed.⁸⁸⁵ *İleri* also published the terms of the Mudanya Armistice with the photographs of İsmet Pasha, General Harrington, and General Monbelli.⁸⁸⁶ When examined the armistice conditions, it is understood that the Turks would never be thrown out of Europe. The registration of the Turks never to be thrown out of Europe was at the same time a testament to the defeat of England and the West. On June 25, 1919, Lloyd George had asked President Wilson whether the Turks could stay in İstanbul. In response to this, Wilson said that “if my opinion is asked, the Turks have been in Europe for many years, and they must be completely wiped out from there.”⁸⁸⁷

With the military and political advantage of this armistice, the Ankara Government could save the Eastern Thrace without fighting. Also, Allied powers for the first time recognized legally the Ankara Government as the sole and legitimate Government of Turkey.⁸⁸⁸ The Mudanya Armistice was acknowledged the diplomatic and legal victory, which displayed the bankruptcy of imperialist policy of the Britain. It was

⁸⁸⁴ *Tasvir-i Efkar*, No.3510-482, 12 Teşrin-i Evvel 1338 [12.10.1922], p. 1. Also, See *Akşam*, No.1455, 11 Teşrin-i Evvel 1338 [11.10.1922], p. 1; *Vakit*, No.1735, 12 Teşrin-i Evvel 1338 [12.10.1922], p. 1.

⁸⁸⁵ *Hakimiyet-i Milliye*, No.634, 15 Teşrin-i Evvel 1338 [15.10.1922], p. 1. For further information, See Yalçın, *Atatürk'ün Milli Dış...*, pp. 136-138; Price, *Ibid.*, p. 207; Baytok, *Ibid.*, p. 198.

⁸⁸⁶ *İleri*, No.1683, 12 Teşrin-i Evvel 1338 [12.10.1922], p. 1.

⁸⁸⁷ Ulubelen, *Ibid.*, p. 184.

⁸⁸⁸ *Hâkimiyet-i Milliye*, No.637, 18 Teşrin-i Evvel 1338 [18.10.1922], p. 1.

also interpreted as the victory of Asia against the Europe.⁸⁸⁹ The British historian Arnold Toynbee described the armistice as follows: “Signing of the armistice means surrendering of the Allied powers under the pressure of the Kemalists’ demands.”⁸⁹⁰

⁸⁸⁹ Yalçın, *Atatürk'ün Milli Dış...*, p. 138.

⁸⁹⁰ Toynbee, *Ibid.*, p. 23.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

After the Mondros Armistice had been signed between the Allies and the Ottoman Empire on October 30, 1918, both nationalist and anti-nationalist press in İstanbul saw the liberation of the country in foreign protectorate. Almost all newspapers supported to enter either American or British patronage. During that time, the press, supporting the foreign protection thought that the Armistice and the peace treaty would already dismember the country; therefore, it would preserve integrity of the country to accept the American or British mandate administration. Although mandate system had been discussed and completely reflected during the Congresses of Erzurum and Sivas, some newspapers like *Vakit*, *Yeni Gün* published in İstanbul still insisted on the foreign protectorate and they tried to attract the attention of President Wilson towards this issue even until beginning of 1920. However, the nationalist newspapers gave up defending American or British protectorate after April in 1920 because they understood that the Nationalists proved themselves sole authority saving the country from the yoke of the enemies. However, the anti-nationalist newspapers always gave support the idea of foreign protectorate and continued to defend their political orientations until the end of the National Struggle.

Following the movement of Mustafa Kemal Pasha to Anatolia on May 19, 1919, some national organizations, or the National Forces, resisting against occupations emerged and spread over in Anatolia. The main purpose of the National Forces was to achieve the independence and integrity of the Turkish people and homeland. Therefore, the Nationalists held local congresses in Anatolia in 1919 and they became the symbols of the determination and courage of the Turkish people at the beginning of the National movement. In fact, these local congresses were the first steps of new “power” in Anatolia. Especially after Sivas Congress (September 4-11, 1919), the Nationalists consolidated their positions and even caused to fall of Damad Ferid Pasha cabinet on October 1, 1919. Hence, the temporary reconciliation was assured between İstanbul and the Nationalists. The National Forces obtained chance

to strengthen their authorities during that period. However, the imperialist powers noticed that reconciliation provided the Nationalists with greater zone of influence; thus, they tried to put them their control by occupying İstanbul on March 16, 1920. In response to this attempt, the Nationalists established their own government on April 23, 1920, in Ankara. The attempts of the Nationalists prepared the ground for creating second formal power, which would last until the end of the National Struggle. Since then, the newspapers gave coverage to a lot of news about the religious, political and military conflict between the İstanbul Government and Ankara Government.

The new government in Ankara endeavored to strengthen its religious and political legitimacy against the İstanbul Government authority by using fatwa and other religious and political discourses. On this point, the nationalist newspapers in İstanbul and Anatolia published articles and declarations supporting the religious discourse of Ankara and fatwa, which legitimated the National resistance movement in terms of religious aspect. These papers claimed that the fatwa of İstanbul - it considered the National movement as madness and banditry and they described the Nationalists as the gangs, brigands, and even rebels against the Sultan-Caliph. It also declared the National movement was not depend on religious base and it was holy duty to kill the Nationalists who rebelled against the Sultan-Caliph - was prepared by force of Britain; that is, it had not value from religious aspect. In addition, they elucidated that the National movement aimed to achieve the liberation of the Sultan-Caliph, who had been taken captured by the enemies. Moreover, nationalist newspapers emphasized that it was a religious obligation to join the legitimate defense movement started in Anatolia because the Nationalists served holy purposes, such as the salvation of the Sultan-Caliph, the Turkish-Muslim people and the country.

Another important point is the political legitimacy of the Nationalists in terms of the relations with the İstanbul Government. The Nationalists tried to achieve the independence of the country from the enemy invasion; therefore, they struggled with the Greeks and Armenians. The army of Ankara Government gained military victories and consolidated its authority against both the İstanbul Government and the

Allied powers. The outcomes of these military victories, the Nationalists concluded many political agreements with the Allied powers. Finally, Mudanya Armistice was signed between Ankara Government and the Allied representatives. In that way, the Allied powers had to recognize the political and military legitimacy of the Ankara Government. In the face of military successes of Ankara, the voice of the anti-nationalists press was silenced. Actually, they had to confirm the political-military authority of the Ankara Government.

The press had been an important factor in guiding and raising awareness during the period of the Turkish National Struggle. In particular, the nationalist newspapers in İstanbul and Anatolia were influential tools in making propaganda in order to get support of the Turkish people for National resistance. They allowed the Nationalists to form unity and solidarity on the way of salvation of the country. However, the İstanbul press was much more influential than Anatolian press. The İstanbul press had rich intellectual staff and the newspapers wrote about almost every subject. The press in İstanbul was always involved in an interaction with the outside world and the newspapers could give the people regular information about what was happening in and outside of the Empire. Accordingly, the newspapers carried out successfully their own duties.

Unlike the İstanbul press, it can be said that the newspapers in Anatolia also tried to enlighten the Anatolian people about the developments but they were not successful to affect the people. It is important point to notice that the literacy rate of Anatolian people and the standard of living was very low in this period, and there was poverty whole Anatolia. Accordingly, people in Anatolia did not care the press or intellectual activities; they just struggled to make a living. Only officials and military commanders in Anatolia were educated and were aware of what was happening in the world. It can be understood from the publications of the newspapers, the Anatolian press was just counter-propaganda tools of the Nationalists, who wanted to unify the people around the national cause. They published official declarations, communiques, laws and orders in order to mobilize the Anatolian people for resistance. It is fact that Anatolian people joined the National resistance and fought with the enemy just for the sake of their Caliph-Sultan, whom they had considered

religious and political leader/ authority for hundred years. The real motive which mobilized the Anatolian people for national case was not the influence of the press, but rather it was religion. As a universal phenomenon, religion emerged as an effective factor to encourage the people to involve the National movement. This point is significant to distinguish the influence of the press in Anatolia.

The İstanbul and Anatolian press referred significant issue with respect to the relations of İstanbul and Ankara. According to the news and interpretations of the newspapers published in İstanbul and Anatolia, the cabinets of Damad Ferid Pasha, who had come to power five times in different periods of time, were not welcomed at all during the National Struggle. While the anti-nationalist newspapers strongly supported the Damat Ferid Pasha cabinets, which described the National Forces as brigand and gangs and tried to undermine the practices of the National Forces, the nationalist newspapers in İstanbul and Anatolia severely criticized him and his cabinets. Therefore, the İstanbul and Ankara permanently clashed with each other in the course of the Ferid Pasha cabinets. On the other hand, it can be inferred from the publications of the nationalist newspapers that all governments formed in İstanbul under the heads of Ali Rıza Pasha, Salih Pasha, and Tevfik Pasha tried to reconcile with the Nationalists and they had pursued a policy of covert resistance to the conditions of the Armistice and to the Allied powers. It was very important point in the history of the Turkish National Struggle to distinguish the collaborationist attitude of the Damat Ferid Pasha cabinets from the reconciliatory activities of the Ali Rıza Pasha, Salih Pasha, and Tevfik Pasha Cabinets, which had tendency to accept the legitimate authority of the Nationalists in Ankara.

In the meantime, the most important category of the press in the period of the National Struggle was the foreign news and articles. Both the nationalist and anti-nationalist newspapers gave coverage to the various foreign news and articles in their columns. The foreign news and interpretations are important in terms of the perception of the outside world about the Turkish National Struggle. It is very clear from the news that Italian and especially the French press supported the National resistance and the Nationalists against the eastern policies of Britain. While the British, Greek and Armenian press thought that the national resistance was a

rebellion and banditry, which required being removed as soon as possible, the French press accepted the Turkish National Struggle as a “political and military power”. Furthermore, both the French and Italian newspapers did not hesitate to write that the leaders of the National resistance movement were “the real representative of Turkish people.” It is clear that French and Italians preferred to support Ankara while Britain insisted on İstanbul. In accordance with the news and interpretations of foreign press, it can be inferred that the Allied powers had diversity of views towards the Anatolian case. In fact, the press reveals that the Allies followed different ways to realize their imperialist policies.

According to the news taken from the Soviet press, Bolshevik regime also gave support the Nationalists. The papers wrote that Soviet Russia considered the Treaty of Sevres was a new imperialist project of the West on Eastern societies. Therefore, Bolsheviks did not approve this treaty and they took side with the Nationalists against the common enemy. However, the intimacy and reconciliatory policy between Soviet Russia and Ankara was interpreted differently by the western press. The foreign news quoted from European press evaluated this intimacy as “a development on the way of making Turks the Bolshevik.” In fact, the European public opinion was worried about threat of Bolshevism. Therefore, the French and Italian press always complained that the British authorities put the Nationalists -as a matter of fact Anatolia- in danger of Bolshevism.

The study also shows that the foreign publications about the Anatolian resistance approached the issue as a whole, contrary to national press. That is, the Anatolian case is not different form the other parts of Middle East. In terms of their arguments, establishing the peace in the East was depend on the situation in Anatolia. In order to assure peace and order in Middle East, the Allied powers had to solve the problems in Anatolia. Italian, French even British newspapers gave wide coverage to the publications, emphasizing the coherence between Anatolia and other regions in the Middle East. The foreign press explicitly confesses that Anatolia was a sore point for salvation of the Middle East as it is today.

The press of the period of National Struggle provided information about almost every aspect of the period. The newspapers published not only the military reports

from fronts but they also mentioned the political relations between Turkey and foreign countries and the economic and social developments in the country. For this reason, the newspapers constitute very important first hand sources for future economic and social studies on this period.

REFERENCES

Newspapers:

<i>Açıksöz</i>	<i>İfham</i>	<i>Peyam-ı Sabah</i>
<i>Akşam</i>	<i>İkdam</i>	<i>Takvim-i Vakayi</i>
<i>Albayrak</i>	<i>İleri</i>	<i>Tasvir-i Efkar</i>
<i>Alemdar</i>	<i>İrade-i Milliye</i>	<i>Türkçe İstanbul</i>
<i>Hadisat</i>	<i>İzmir'e Doğru</i>	<i>Vakit</i>
<i>Hakimiyet-i Milliye</i>	<i>Öğüt</i>	<i>Yeni Gün</i>

Books:

- Adivar, Halide Edip, *Türk'ün Ateşle İmtihanı*, (İstanbul: Özgür Yayınları, 2005).
- Akandere, Osman - Polat, Hasan Ali, *Damat Ferit Paşa Hükümetlerinin Milli Mücadele Karşısı Politikaları*, (Ankara: AAMY, 2011).
- Akşin, Sina, *İstanbul Hükümetleri ve Milli Mücadele*, Vol. I-II, (İstanbul: TİBKY, 2004).
- Akyol, Taha, *1919-1920, Mondros, Sevr ve Kuva-yı Milliye*, (İstanbul: Doğan Egmont Yayıncılık, 2016).
- Albayrak, Mustafa, *Milli Mücadele Dönemi'nde Batı Anadolu Kongreleri*, (Ankara: AAMY, 1998).
- Alemdar, Korkmaz, *İletişim ve Tarih*, (Ankara: İmge Kitabevi, 1996).
- Altunsu, Abdülkadir, *Osmanlı Şeyhülislamı*, (Ankara: Ayyıldız Matbaası A.Ş., 1972).

- Apak, Rahmi, *İstiklal Savaşında Garp Cephesi Nasıl Kuruldu*, (Ankara: TTK, 1990).
- Aralov, Semyon İ., *Bir Sovyet Diplomatının Türkiye Anıları (1922-1923)*, Trans. By Hasan Ali Ediz, (İstanbul: TİBKY, 2010).
- Arıburnu, Kemal, *Sivas Kongresi: Samsun'dan Ankara'ya Kadar Olaylar ve Anılarla*, (Ankara: AAMY, 1997).
- Armstrong, H. C., *Bozkurt*, Trans. By Ahmet Çuhadar, (İstanbul: Kamer Yayınları, 2016).
- Aşkun, Vehbi Cem, *Sivas Kongresi*, (İstanbul: İnkılap ve Aka Kitabevleri, 1963).
- Atabay, Mithat, *Milli Mücadele Tarihi*, (İstanbul: Kriter Yayınları, 2010).
- Atabay, Mithat, *Türk Basın Tarihi; 1981'den Günümüze Türk Basını Tarihi ve Gazeteciler*, (Edirne: Paradigma Akademi Yayınları, 2015).
- Atatürk, Mustafa Kemal, *Nutuk (1920-1927)*, Vol. I-II, Prep. By Zeynep Korkmaz ve İsmet Gönülal, (Ankara: Başbakanlık Basımevi, 1984).
- Atatürk İle İlgili Arşiv Belgeleri*, (1911-1921 Tarihleri Arasına Ait 106 Belge), (Ankara: Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi Daire Başkanlığı, 1982).
- Atatürk'ün Tamim, Telgraf ve Beyannameleri (1917-1938), IV, (Ankara: TTK, 1991).
- Atay, Falih Rıfkı, *Çankaya*, (İstanbul: SENA Matbaası, 1980).
- Aybars, Ergün, *İstiklal Mahkemeleri*, Vol. I-II, (İzmir: Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1988).
- Aybars, Ergün, *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Tarihi*, Vol. I, (İzmir: Ege Üniversitesi, 1984).
- Aydemir, Şevket Süreyya, *Tek Adam: Mustafa Kemal (1919-1922)*, Vol. II, (İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 2006).
- Aydoğan, Erdal, *Samsun'dan Erzurum'a Mustafa Kemal*, (Ankara: AAMY, 2000).
- Aydoğan, Metin, *Mustafa Kemal ve Kurtuluş Savaşı (1919-1923)*, (İzmir: Umay Yayınları, 2006).

- Ayışığı, Metin, *Mareşal Ahmet İzzet Paşa (Askeri ve Siyasi Hayatı)*, (Ankara: TTK, 2013).
- Bayar, Celal, *Ben De Yazdım*, Vol. VI, (İstanbul: Baha Matbaası, 1968).
- Baykara, Tuncer, *Milli Mücadele*, (Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1985).
- Baytok, Taner, *İngiliz Belgeleriyle Sevr'den Lozan'a: Dünden Bugüne Değişen Ne Var?* (İstanbul: Doğan Kitap, 2007).
- Beyoğlu, Süleyman, ‘‘*Milli Mücadele ve Özbekler Tekkesi*’’, Üsküdar Sempozyumu I, 23-25 Mayıs Bildirileri, Vol. I, (İstanbul: Üsküdar Belediye Başkanlığı Üsküdar Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2004).
- Bıyıklıoğlu, Tevfik, *Atatürk Anadolu'da*, (Ankara: Kent Basımevi, 1981).
- Bilsel, Cemil, *Lozan*, Vol. I, (İstanbul: Sosyal Yayınlar, 1998).
- Birgen, Muhittin, *İttihat ve Terakki'de On Sene*, Prep. By Zeki Arıkan, (İstanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 2017).
- Bozkurt, Abdurrahman, *İtilaf Devletleri'nin İstanbul'da İşgal Yönetimi*, (Ankara: AAMY, 2014).
- Cebesoy, Ali Fuat, *Milli Mücadele Hatıraları*, (İstanbul: Vatan Neşriyat, 1953).
- Cebesoy, Ali Fuat, *Moskova Hatıraları*, (İstanbul: Vatan Neşriyat, 1955).
- Criss, Nur Bilge, *Istanbul Under Allied Occupation (1918-1923)*, (Leiden; Boston; Köln: Brill, 1999).
- Çakır, Hamza, *Osmanlıda Basın-İktidar İlişkileri, (Azınlık Basını, Türkçe Basın ve Dış Basın)*, (Ankara: Siyasal Kitabevi, 2002).
- Çavdar, Necati, *Son Osmanlı Sadrazamı Ahmet Tevfik Paşa*, (Ankara: Berikan Yayınevi, 2016).
- Çavdar, Tevfik, *İz Bırakan Gazeteler ve Gazeteciler, Babıali'den Geriye Ne Kaldı?*, (Ankara: İmge Kitapevi Yayınları, 2007).
- Çetin, Nurten, *Son Sadrazam Ahmet Tevfik Paşa*, (Ankara: AAMY, 2015).

- Demirözü, Damla, *Savaştan Barışa Giden Yol: Atatürk Dönemi Türkiye -Yunanistan İlişkileri*, (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2007).
- Duman, Hasan, *Osmanlı-Türk Süreli Yayınları ve Gazeteleri (1828-1928) Vol. I*, (Ankara: Enformasyon ve Dokümantasyon Hizmetleri Vakfı, 2000).
- Dursunoğlu, Cevat, *Milli Mücadelede Erzurum*, (Ankara: [s.n.], 1946).
- Er, Turgut, *Türkiye’de Basın Yayın ve Tanıtma*, (Ankara: Ümit Yayıncılık ve Matbaacılık, 2003).
- Erdeha, Kamil, *Milli Mücadelede Vilayetler ve Valiler*, (İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1975).
- Eroğlu, Hamza, *Türk İnkılap Tarihi*, (İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1982).
- Ertürk, Hüsamettin, *İki Devrin Perde Arkası*, Comp. By Samih Nafiz Tansu, (İstanbul: Pınar Yayınevi, 1964).
- Eski Harfli Türkçe Süreli Yayınlar Toplu Kataloğu*, Vol. I, (Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Milli Kütüphane Başkanlığı Yayınları, 1987).
- Eski, Mustafa, *Kastamonu Basınında Milli Mücadele’nin Yankıları*, (Ankara: TTK, 1995).
- Evans, Laurence, *Türkiye'nin Parçalanması ve ABD Politikası, (1914-1924)*, Trans. By. T. Alaya, N. Uğurlu, (İstanbul: Milliyet Yayınları, 1972).
- Ezherli, İhsan, *Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi (1920-1992) ve Osmanlı Meclis-i Mebusanı (1877-1920)*, (Ankara: TBMM Basımevi, 1992).
- Gentizon, Paul, *Mustafa Kemal ve Uyanan Doğu*, Trans. By Fethi Ülkü, (Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1983).
- Gerede, Hüsrev, *Hüsrev Gerede’nin Anıları: Kurtuluş Savaşı, Atatürk ve Devrimler*, Prep. By Sami Önal, (İstanbul: Literatür Yayıncılık, 2002).
- Girgin, Atilla, *Türk Basın Tarih’inde Yerel Gazetecilik*, (İstanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi, 2001).
- Goloğlu, Mahmut, *Erzurum Kongresi*, (İstanbul: TİBKY, 2008).
- Goloğlu, Mahmut, *Sivas Kongresi*, (İstanbul: TİBKY, 2008).

- Golođlu, Mahmut, *Üçüncü Meşrutiyet (1920): Birinci Büyük Millet Meclisi*, (İstanbul: TİBKY, 2008).
- Gökbilgin, Muzaffer Tayyip, *Milli Mücadele Başlarken, (Mondros Mütarekesi'nden Büyük Millet Meclisi'nin Açılmasına)*, (Ankara: TİBKY, 2011).
- Göyünç, Nejat, “Musul, Misak-ı Milliye Dahil Midir, Değil Midir?” *Misak-ı Milli ve Türk Dış Politikasında Musul*, (Ankara: AAMY, 1998).
- Göze, Ayferi, *Türk Kurtuluş Savaşı ve Devrimi Tarihi*, (İstanbul: Sermet Matbaası, 1989).
- Gülmez, Nurettin, *Kurtuluş Savaşı'nda Anadolu'da Yeni Gün*, (Ankara: AAMY, 1999).
- Gündüz, Uğur, “Kurtuluş Savaşı'nda Yerel Basının Rolü”: *Türkiye'de Yerel Basın*, Suat Sezgin (Editor) (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Yayınları, 2007).
- Güner, Zekai- Kabataş, Orhan, *Milli Mücadele Dönemi Beyannameleri ve Basını*, (Ankara: Atatürk Kültür Merkezi Yayını, 1990).
- Güneş, İhsan, *Meşrutiyet'ten Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye'de Hükümetler, Programları ve Meclisteki Yankıları (1908-1923)*, (İstanbul: TİBKY, 2012).
- Gürün, Kamuran, *Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri (1920-1953)*, (Ankara: TTK, 2010).
- Hayta, Necdet, *Tarih Araştırmalarına Kaynak Olarak Tasvir-i Efkar Gazetesi (1278/1862-1286/1869)*, (Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı, 2002).
- İğdemir, Uluğ, *Sivas Kongresi Tutanakları*, (Ankara: TTK, 1969).
- İnal, İbnülemin Mahmud Kemal, *Osmanlı Devrinde Son Sadrazamlar*, Vol. XIII, (İstanbul: TİBKY, 2012).
- İnan, Afet, *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti ve Türk Devrimi*, (Ankara: TTK, 1977).
- İnönü, İsmet, *Hatıralar*, Prep. By Sabahattin Selek, (İstanbul: Bilgi Yayınevi, 2009).
- İnuğur, Mehmet Nuri, *Basın ve Yayın Tarihi*, (İstanbul: Der Yarınları, 2002).
- İskit, Server, *Türkiye'de Matbuat İdareleri ve Politikaları*, (Ankara: Başvekalet Basın ve Yayın Umum Müdürlüğü Yayınları, 1943).

- Jaeschke, Gotthard, *Kurtuluş Savaşı İle İlgili İngiliz Belgeleri*, Trans. By Cemal Köprülü, (Ankara: TTK, 2011).
- Jaeschke, Gotthard, *Türk Kurtuluş Savaşı Kronolojisi*, (Ankara: TTK, 1970).
- Kansu, Mazhar Müfit, *Erzurum'dan Ölümüne Kadar Atatürk'le Beraber*, (Ankara: TTK, Vol. I, 1966; Vol. II, 1968).
- Karabekir, Kazım, *İstiklal Harbimiz*, Vol. I-IV, Prep. By Faruk Özerengin, (İstanbul: Emre Yayınları, 2000).
- Karabekir, Kazım, *İstiklal Harbimizin Esasları*, Prep. By Faruk Özerengin, (İstanbul, Emre Yayınları, 2000).
- Karal, Enver Ziya, *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Tarihi (1918-1953)*, (İstanbul: Cumhuriyet Matbaası, 1954).
- Karal, Halil İbrahim, *Turkish Relations With Soviet Russia During The National Liberation War of Turkey, 1918-1922*, (Los Angeles: University of California, 1967).
- Karaosmanoğlu, Yakup Kadri, *Ergenekon: Milli Mücadele Yazıları*, (İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1964).
- Kavaklı, Nurhan, *Bir Gazetenin Tarihi Akşam*, (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2005).
- Keskin, Mustafa...[et al.]; *Türk İnkılabı ve Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Tarihi*, (Kayseri: Ufuk Yayınları, 1995).
- Kılıç Ali, (Süleyman Asaf Emrullah), *Kılıç Ali'nin Anıları*, Comp. By Hulusi Turgut, (İstanbul: TİBKY, 2007).
- Kırkpınar, Kenan, *Ulusal Kurtuluş Savaşı Dönemi İngiltere ve Türkiye (1919 – 1922)*, (İstanbul: Pohenix, 2004).
- Kili, Suna- Gözübüyük, Şeref, *Sened-i İttifak'tan Günümüze Türk Anayasa Metinleri*, (İstanbul: TİBKY, 2006).
- Kili, Suna, *Türk Devrim Tarihi*, (İstanbul: TİBKY, 2008).
- Kinross, Lord, *Atatürk: The Rebirth of A Nation*, (Northern Cyprus: K. Rustem&Brother, 1964).

- Kocabaşođlu, Uygur, ‘‘Hürriyet’’i Beklerken İkinci Meşrutiyet Basını, (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2010).
- Kolođlu, Orhan, *Son Sadrazam: Milli Mücadele Taraftarı Ahmed Tevfik Paşa*, (İstanbul: Dođan Egmont Yayıncılık, 2007).
- Korkud, Refik, *Milli Mücadele Takvimi*, (Ankara: Ege Matbaası, 1963).
- Kurat, Yuluđ Tekin, *Osmanlı İmparatorluđu’nun Paylaşılması*, (Ankara: Kalite Matbaası, 1976).
- Mango, Andrew, *Atatürk*, (London: John Murray, 2004).
- Mango, Andrew, *From the Sultan to Atatürk: Turkey*, (London: Haus, 2009).
- Miralay Bekir Sami Günsav’ın *Kurtuluş Savaşı Anıları*, Prep. By Muhittin Ünal, (İstanbul: Cem Yayınevi, 1994).
- Moralı, Nail, *Mütarekede İzmir, Önceleri ve Sonraları*, Prep. By Erkan Serçe, (İzmir: İzmir Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür Yayını, 2002).
- Mumcu, Ahmet, *Tarih Açısından Türk Devriminin Temelleri ve Gelişimi*, (İstanbul: İnkılap Yayınevi, 1986).
- Olcaı, Osman, *Sevres Andlaşmasına Doğru (Çeşitli Konferans ve Toplantıların Tutanakları...)*, 100. Dođum Yılında Atatürk’e Armađan Dizisi, (Ankara: Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayınları, 1981).
- Oral, Fuat Süreyya, *Türk Basın Tarihi (1919-1965 Cumhuriyet Dönemi)*, İkinci Kitap, (Ankara: Dođuş Matbaası, 1968).
- Orbay, Hüseyin Rauf, *Cehennem Deđirmeni-Siyası Hatıralarım*, Prep. By İzmet Bozdađ, (İstanbul: Emre Yayınları, 2000).
- Önder, Mehmet, *Milli Mücadelenin Yanında ve Safında Öđüd Gazetesi*, (Ankara: Güven Matbaası, 1986).
- Özerdim, Sami N., *Atatürkçünün El Kitabı* (Ankara: TDKY, 1981).
- Özkaya, Yücel... [et al.]; *Gazi Mustafa Kemal Atatürk’ün Hayatı*, (Ankara: AAMY, 2012).
- Özkaya, Yücel, ‘‘Hâkimiyet-i Milliye’’, Türk Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi, Vol. XV, İstanbul, 1997.

- Özkaya, Yücel... [et al.]; *Milli Mücadele Tarihi: Makaleler*, Vol. I, (Ankara: AAMY, 2005).
- Özkaya, Yücel, *Milli Mücadele'de Atatürk ve Basın*, (Ankara: AAMY, 1989).
- Özsoy, Osman, *Sultanattan Cumhuriyete Kurtuluş Savaşı; Olaylar – Belgeler - Gerçekler*, (İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları, 2007).
- Öztoprak, İzzet, *Türk ve Batı Kamuoyunda Milli Mücadele*, (Ankara: TTK, 2014).
- Parlak, Türkmen, *İşgalden Kurtuluşa ‘1’*, *Yunan Ege'ye Nasıl Geldi ‘İlk Günler’*, (İzmir: Duyal Matbaacılık, 1982).
- Price, Clair, *The Rebirth of Turkey*, (New York: Thomas Seltzer, 1923).
- Sander, Limon Von, *Türkiye'de Beş Yıl*, Trans. By M. Şevki Yazman, (İstanbul: Baha Matbaası, 1968).
- Sarihan, Zeki, *Kurtuluş Savaşı Günlüğü*, Vol. I-II, (Ankara: Öğretmen Yayınları, 1986).
- Sarihan, Zeki, *Kurtuluş Savaşı'nda İkili İktidar*, (İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları, 2000).
- Sarikoyuncu, Ali, *Milli Mücadelede Din Adamları* Vol. I, (Ankara: Diyanet İşleri Başkanlığı Yayını, 2007).
- Selek, Sabahattin, *Anadolu İhtilali*, Vol. I-II, (İstanbul: Kastaş Yayınevi, 2010).
- Selvi, Haluk, *Milli Mücadelede Erzurum (1918 – 1923)*, (Ankara: AAMY, 2000).
- Selvi, Haluk, *Milli Mücadele'de İlk İşgaller ve İlk Direnişler*, (İstanbul: Yeditepe Yayınevi, 2011).
- Sertel, M. Zekeriya, *Hatırladıklarım*, (İstanbul: Yaylacık Matbaası, 1968).
- Sonyel, Salahi R., *Kurtuluş Savaşı Günlerinde İngiliz İstihbarat Servisi'nin Türkiye'deki Eylemleri*, (Ankara: TTK, 1995).
- Sonyel, Salahi R., *Türk Kurtuluş Savaşı ve Dış Politikası*, Vol. I, (Ankara: TTK, 1973).
- Soysal, İsmail, *Tarihçeleri ve Açıklamaları ile Birlikte Türkiye'nin Siyasal Andlaşmaları*, Vol. I, (1920-1945), (Ankara: TTK, 1983).

- Söylemezoğlu, Galip Kemali, *Yok Edilmek İstenen Millet*, (İstanbul: Selek Neşriyat, 1957).
- Şamsutdinov, A. M., *Mondros'tan Lozan'a Türkiye Ulusal Kurtuluş Savaşı Tarihi (1918-1923)*, Trans. By Ataol Behramoğlu, (İstanbul: Doğan Kitapçılık, 1999).
- Şimşir, Bilal N, *Malta Sürgünleri*, (İstanbul: Bilgi Yayınevi, 2009).
- Taçalan, Nurdoğan, *Ege'de Kurtuluş Savaşı Başlarken*, (İstanbul: Milliyet Yayınları, 1970).
- Tamer, Aytül, *İrade-i Milliye, Ulusal Mücadelenin İlk Resmi Yayın Organı*, (İstanbul: Türkiye Sosyal Tarih Araştırma Vakfı, 2004).
- Tansel, Selahaddin, *Mondros'tan Mudanya'ya Kadar*, Vol. I-III, (Ankara: Başbakanlık Basımevi, 1973).
- Tekeli, İlhan-İlkin, Selim, *Ege'deki Sivil Direnişten Kurtuluş Savaşı'na Geçerken Uşak Heyet-i Merkeziyesi ve İbrahim (Tahtakılıç) Bey*, (Ankara: TTK, 1989).
- Tengirşenk, Yusuf Kemal, *Vatan Hizmetinde*, (İstanbul: Bahar Matbaası, 1967).
- Tevetoğlu, Fethi, *Atatürk'le Samsun'a Çıkanlar*, (Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1987).
- Topuz, Hıfzı, *II. Mahmut'tan Holdinglere Türk Basın Tarihi*, (İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 2003).
- Toynbee, Arnold J., *Türkiye: Bir Devletin Yeniden Doğuşu*, Vol. II, Trans. By Kasım Yargıcı, (İstanbul: Çağdaş Matbaacılık ve Yayıncılık, 2000).
- Tunaya, Tarık Zafer, *Türkiye'de Siyasal Partiler*, Vol. II, *Mütareke Dönemi, 1918-1922*, (İstanbul: Hürriyet Vakfı Yayınları, 1986).
- Turan, Mustafa, *Yunan Mezalimi (İzmir, Aydın, Manisa, Denizli-1919-1923)*, (Ankara: AAMY, 1999).
- Türkgeldi, Ali, *Moudros ve Mudanya Mütarekelerinin Tarihi*, (Ankara: Türk Devrim Tarihi Enstitüsü Yayınları, 1948).
- Türkgeldi, Ali Fuat, *Görüp İştiklerim* (Ankara: TTK, 1951).

Türk İstiklal Harbi, Vol. I, (*Mondros Mütarekesi ve Tatbikatı*), (Ankara: Gnkur. Basımevi, 1962).

Türk İstiklal Harbi, Vol. III, (*Doğu Cephesi*), (Ankara: Gnkur. Basımevi, 1965).

Türkmen, Zekeriya, *Mütareke Döneminde Ordunun Durumu Ve Yeniden Yapılanması (1918 – 1920)*, (Ankara: TTK, 2001).

Ulubelen, Erol, *İngiliz Gizli Belgelerinde Türkiye*, (İstanbul: Cumhuriyet Kitapları, 2006).

Umar, Bilge, *İzmir’de Yunanlıların Son Günleri*, (Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1974).

Varlık, Bülent, “Mütareke ve Milli Mücadele Basını”, *Tanzimattan Cumhuriyete Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, Vol. V, İstanbul.

Yalçın, Durmuş...[et al.]; *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Tarihi*, Vol. I, (Ankara: AAMY, 2004).

Yalçın, E. Semih, *Atatürk’ün Milli Dış Siyaseti* (Ankara: Berikan Yayınevi, 2010).

Yalçın, E. Semih, *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Tarihinin Kaynakları*, (Ankara: Berikan Yayınları, 2015).

Yalman, Ahmet Emin, *Turkey in My Time*, (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1956).

Yalman, Ahmet Emin, *Yakın Tarihte Gördüklerim ve Geçirdiklerim (1888-1918)*, Vol. I-II, (İstanbul: Yenilik Basımevi, 1970).

Yavuz, Bige, *Kurtuluş Savaşı Döneminde Türk-Fransız İlişkileri: Fransız Arşiv Belgeleri Açısından 1919-1922*, (Ankara: TTK, 1994).

Articles:

Akandere, Osman, “Damat Ferit Paşa’nın IV. Hükümeti Döneminde Kuvâ-yı Milliye İleri Gelenleri Hakkında Verilen İdam Kararları”, *Ankara Üniversitesi TİTE AYD*, No. 43 (2009), pp. 343-406.

Armaoğlu, Fahir, “İngiliz Belgelerinde İstanbul’un İşgali”, *Belleten*, Vol. LXII, No. 234 (1999), pp. 467-494.

- Aydın, Hakan, “Sakarya Savaşı’nda Anadolu’da Yeni Gün”, *Selçuk Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Akademik Dergisi*, Vol. VI, No. 2 (2010), pp. 218-229.
- Aytepe, Oğuz, “Milli Mücadele’de Bilecik Görüşmesi” *Ankara Üniversitesi TİTE-AYD*, No. 33 (2004), pp. 23-31.
- Baykal, Hülya, “Milli Mücadele’de Basın”, *AAMD*, Vol. IV, No. 11 (1988), pp. 471-479.
- Budak, Mustafa, “Hangi Misak-ı Milli”, *Yeni Türkiye Cumhuriyet Özel Sayısı*, Vol. I, No. 23-24 (1998), pp. 250-253.
- Budak, Ömer, “Milli Mücadele Dönemi Türk-Fransız İlişkileri”, *Karadeniz Araştırmaları*, No. 19 (2008), pp. 97-114.
- Çağlar, Günay, “Milli Mücadele’de Fetvalar Olayına Değişik Bir Açıdan Bakış”, *Atatürk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 75. Yıl Özel Sayısı, No. 11 (1999), pp. 265-281.
- Çelik, Kemal, “Milli Mücadele’de İç İsyanlar, Vatana İhanet Kanunu ve İstiklâl Mahkemeleri”, *Ankara Üniversitesi TİTE-AYD*, No. 40 (2007), pp. 569-613.
- Çukurova, Bülent, “15 Mayıs 1919 İzmir’de Yunan Mezalimi”, *AAMD*, Vol. III, No. 8 (1987), pp. 461-471.
- Demir, Kenan, “Osmanlı’da Basının Doğuşu ve Gazeteler”, *Iğdır Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, No. 5 (2014), pp. 57-88.
- Demirözü, Damla, “Megali İdea’dan Ankara Antlaşması’na (1930) Eleftherios Venizelos”, *Ankara Üniversitesi TİTE-AYD*, No. 35-36 (2005), pp. 291-312.
- Dervişoğlu, Fatih M., “Milli Mücadele Döneminde Basın ve İrade-i Milliye Gazetesi”, *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, Vol. II, No. 6 (2009), pp. 159-166.
- Duman, Selçuk, “Ali Rıza Paşa Hükümetinin Kuruluşu”, *Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, Vol. XII, No. 2 (2002), pp. 341-358.
- Ergin, Feridun, “Mütareke Kabineleri”, *AAMD*, Vol. VII, No. 21 (1991), pp. 391-406.

- Eski, Mustafa, “Mütareke Sonrasında Kastamonu’ya Gelen Önemli Kişiler”, *AAMD*, Vol. XV, No. 45 (1999), pp. 1039-1088.
- Güçlü, Muhammet, “Antalya’da Anadolu Gazetesine Göre Lomdra Konferansı’na Katılan Ankara Heyeti’nin Avrupa’ya Yolculuğu (6-22 Şubat 1921), *Çağdaş Türkiye Tarihi Araştırmaları Dergisi*, XVI, No. 33 (2016), pp. 71-91.
- Halaçoğlu, Ahmet, “Amasya Protokolü ve Osmanlı Hükümetleri”, *AAMD*, Vol. XV, No. 43 (1999), pp. 229-234.
- Kapıcı, Hikmet Zeki, “Matbuat ve İstihbarat Umum Müdürlüğü’nün İstihbarat Çalışmaları Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme”, *The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies*, No. 33 (2015), pp. 261-278.
- Kaya, Erol, “Milli Mücadele’de İzmir’e Doğru Gazetesi”, *International Periodical For the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, Vol. III, No. 1 (2008), pp. 296-314.
- Keleşyılmaz, Vahdet, “Bir Kuva-yı Milliye Gazetesine Göre Türk Barışı ve İngiltere”, *Ankara Üniversitesi TİTE-AYD*, Vol. III, No. 12 (1993), pp. 249-264.
- Kısıklı, Emine, “Sivas Kongresi’nin Milli Mücadele’de Kamuoyu Oluşturması Açısından Önemi”, *TİTE-AYD*, Vol. XVI (1988), pp. 29-42.
- Köstüklü, Nuri, “Birinci İnönü Muharebesi ve Siyasi Sonuçları Üzerine Bazı Düşünceler”, *AAMD*, Vol. VII, No. 21, (1991), pp. 603-607.
- Mert, Özcan, “Anzavur’un İlk Ayaklanmasına Ait Belgeler”, *Bellekten*, Vol. LVI, No. 217 (1992), pp. 847-972.
- Öksüz, Melek, “Amerikan Belgelerine Göre I. Dünya Savaşı ve Mütareke Dönemlerinde Osmanlı Hükümetleri”, *Turkish Studies, (International Periodical For the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic)*, Vol. V, No. 1 (2010), pp. 1247-1270.
- Önder, Mehmet, “Milli Mücadele’nin Gazetesi Hakimiyet-i Milliye Nasıl Çıkarıldı?”, *AAMD*, Vol. VII, No. 20 (1991), pp. 285-302.
- Özbudun, Ergun, “Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi Hükümeti’nin Hukuki Niteliği”, *AAMD*, Vol. I, No. 2 (1985), pp. 475-503.

- Özçelik, Mücahit, “Açıksöz Gazetesinde Sakarya Savaşı”, *Tarihin Peşinde Uluslararası Tarih ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, No. 6 (2011), pp. 195-214.
- Özgül, Cemil, “Atatürk’ün Ankara’ya Gelişi”, *AAMD*, Vol. X, No. 28 (1994), pp. 137-156.
- Özkaya, Yücel, “Milli Mücadele’de Anadolu Ajansı’nın Kuruluşu ve Faaliyetlerine Ait Bazı Belgeler”, *AAMD*, Vol. I, No. 2 (1985), pp. 587-607.
- Özkaya, Yücel, “Milli Mücadele Başlangıcında Basın ve Mustafa Kemal Paşa’nın Basınla İlişkileri”, *AAMD*, Vol. I, No. 3 (1985), pp. 871-911.
- Öztoprak, İzzet, “Dışişleri Bakanı Bekir Sami Bey’in İstifası Meselesi”, *AAMD*, Vol. IX, No. 25 (1992), pp. 95-107.
- Özüçetin, Yaşar, “Anadolu Gazetelerinden Biri Olan “ İzmir’e Doğru” ve Pierre Loti’nin Gazetede ki Yazıları”, *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, Vol. IV, No. 18 (2011), pp. 264-273.
- Sonyel, Salahi R., “Kurtuluş Savaşı Günlerinde Doğu Siyasamız” *Bellekten*, Vol. XLI, No. 164 (1977), pp. 657-731.
- Söylemez, Faruk, “Milli Mücadele’de Kastamonu Basını”, *Ankara Üniversitesi TİTE-AYD*, Vol. III, No. 12 (1993), pp. 411-416.
- Turan, Mustafa, “İzmir’in İşgali Üzerine”, *AAMD*, Vol. XII, No. 36 (1996), pp. 739-753.
- Turan, Ömer, “Milli Mücadele’nin Lehine Kamuoyu Oluşumunda Din Adamları”, *AAMD*, Vol. XV, No. 45 (1999), pp. 821- 834.
- Türker, Hasan, “Tevfik Paşa Hükümeti’nin Anadolu ile Uzlaşma Arayışı ve Bilecik Buluşmasının Basındaki Yansımaları (1920)”, *Çağdaş Türkiye Tarihi Araştırmaları Dergisi*, XVII/34 (2017-Bahar), p. 87.
- Türkmen, Zekeriya, “30 Ekim 1918 Tarihli Mondros Ateşkes Antlaşması’na Göre Türk Ordusu’nun Kuruluş ve Kadrosuna Bir Bakış”, *Osmanlı Tarihi Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi Dergisi*, (OTAM), No. XI (2000), pp. 615-632.
- Uca, Alaattin, “Erzurum’da Milli Mücadele Döneminde Yayınlanan Albayrak Gazetesi’ndeki İlanlar”, *Atatürk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Dergisi* [TAED], No. 42 (2010), pp. 259-282.

Ulusoy, Belkıs, “Milli Mücadele, Propaganda, Atatürk ve Basın”, *İstanbul Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Dergisi*, No. 20 (2004), pp. 55-64.

Ural, Selçuk, “Ali Galip Olayı'nın Milli Mücadele Taraftarı Gazetelerdeki (İrade-i Milliye ve Albayrak) Yankıları”, *Ankara Üniversitesi TİTE-AYD*, No. 29-30 (2002), pp. 159-174.

Uyanık, Necmi- Mihçı, Sebahattin, “Refi Cevat'ta Siyasi Düşüncenin Değişimi Üzerine”, *Uluslararası Tarih ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, No. 12 (2014), pp. 315-329.

Yetkin, Bilgen, “Milli Türk Fırkası'nın Sesi İfham Gazetesi'nin Mütareke Dönemine Bakışı (1919-1920)”, *Uluslararası Tarih ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, No. 7 (2012), pp. 1-26.

Yıldırım, Hüseyin, “İrade-i Milliye Gazetesi”, *AAMD*, Vol. VIII, No. 23 (1992), pp. 325-330.

Zeyrek, Şerafettin, “Amasya Mülakatı”, *AAMD*, Vol. V, No. 14 (1989), pp. 467-477.

Dissertations:

Akız, Metin, “Hâkimiyet-i Milliye Gazetesi (1920-1923)”, (U.M.T.), (Manisa: Celal Bayar Üniversitesi, 2006).

Aydoğdu, Murat, “Mütareke Döneminin Son İstanbul Hükümeti – Son Ahmet Tevfik Paşa Hükümeti (21 Ekim 1920-4 Kasım 1922)”, (U.D.D.), (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi, 2016).

Ayhan, Bünyamin, “Olağanüstü Durumlarda Toplumsal Dayanışma ve Bütünleşmeye Basının Katkısı: Milli Mücadele Dönemi Türk Basını”, (U.D.D.), (Konya: Selçuk Üniversitesi, 2005).

Aysal, Necdet, “Türkiye’de İslami Düşüncenin Örgütlenmesi ve Hedefleri (31 Mart Olayı’ndan DP’nin İktidara Gelişine Kadar, 1909-1950)”, (U.D.D.), (Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi, 2004).

Bilgin, Taner, “Milli Mücadele Döneminde Bilecik”, (U.D.D.), (Sakarya: Sakarya Üniversitesi, 2012).

- Böke, Pelin, “Yeni Gün”den “Cumhuriyet”e Yunus Nadi”, (U.D.D.), (İzmir: Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, 1994).
- Çelik, Yasemin, “Hakimiyet-i Milliye Gazetesine Göre İstanbul Hükümetleri (1920-1922)”, (U.M.T.), (Kayseri: Erciyes Üniversitesi, 2015).
- Çıtır Bekmezci, Şerife, “Mehmet Asım’ın Vakit Gazetesi’ndeki Milli Mücadele Dönemi Yazıları (1919-1921)”, (U.M.T.), (Konya: Selçuk Üniversitesi, 2004).
- Dönmez, Elif, “Mondros Ateşkes Antlaşması’nın Milli Mücadele’ye Yansımaları”, (U.M.T.), (Nevşehir: Nevşehir Üniversitesi, 2012).
- Ersaydı, Alper, “Alemdar Gazetesine Göre Mütareke Dönemi Başında İttihatçılar ve İttihatçılık”, (U.M.T.), (Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi, 2007).
- Güneşer Erzurum, Şirin, “The Greek Occupation of İzmir and Protest Meetings in İstanbul 15 May 1919 – 13 January 1920”, (U.M.T.), (İstanbul: Boğaziçi University, 2015).
- Işık, Tevfik, “Anadolu Ajansı ve Türk Medyasına Katkısı (Yazılı Basın 2005 Yılı Değerlendirmesi)”, (U.M.T.), (Kayseri: Erciyes Üniversitesi, 2006).
- Işıl, Safiye Karaca, “Milli Mücadele Döneminde Türk-Ermeni İlişkileri (1919-1923)”, (U.M.T.), (Kahramanmaraş: Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam Üniversitesi, 2010).
- Kaplan, Abdurrahman, “Milli Mücadele Dönemi ve Sonrasında Mehmet Rıfat (Börekçi) Efendi”, (U.M.T.), (Erzurum: Atatürk Üniversitesi, 2010).
- Karahan, A. Kadir, “Milli Mücadele Basını”, (U.M.T.), (İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi, 1988).
- Sancaktar, Fatih Mehmet, “Said Molla ve Türkçe İstanbul”, (U.M.T.), (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi, 1996).
- Şirin, Funda Selçuk, “Falih Rıfkı Atay (1893-1950)”, (U.M.T.), (Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi, 2009).
- Tektosun, Mustafa, “Milli Mücadele Döneminde Doğu Cephesi”, (U.M.T.), (Diyarbakır: Dicle Üniversitesi, 2007).
- Tunç, Salih, “İşgal Döneminde İstanbul Basını (1918-1922)”, (U.D.D.), (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi, 1999).

Yetim, Murat, ‘‘I. İnönü Zaferi’nden İzmir’in Kurtuluşuna Kadar Açıksöz Gazetesi’nde Harici Haberler’’, (U.M.T.), (Erzincan: Erzincan Üniversitesi, 2015).

Yıldız, Emrah, ‘‘Hakimiyet-i Milliye Gazetesi Örneğinde Türk Ulusal Kimliğinin İnşası Süreci (1920-1926)’’, (U.M.T.), (Mersin: Mersin Üniversitesi, 2009).

Yılmaz, Hadiye, ‘‘Peyam-Sabah Gazetesinde Milli Mücadele’’, (U.D.D.), (İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi, 2014).

APPENDICES

A. TURKISH SUMMARY / TÜRKE ÖZET

Bu çalışmada, Millî Mücadele döneminde, 1918 ve 1922 yılları arasında Türk Milliyetçilerinin hem İstanbul Hükümetleri hem de İtilaf Devletleri ve Sovyet Rusya ile kurduğu ilişkiler dönemin İstanbul ve Anadolu'da yayınlanan gazetelerine yansıdığı ölçüde ele alınmıştır. Bu bağlamda, Milli Mücadelenin dini-hukuki ve diplomatik-askeri meşruiyeti özel olarak ele alınmıştır. Sonuç olarak, Anadolu'daki Türk Milliyetçilerinin, bir taraftan düşman kuvvetleriyle sahada savaşırken diğer taraftan hem İstanbul Hükümetlerine hem de itilaf Devletlerine karşı dini, hukuki ve diplomatik meşruiyetini de gerçekleştirdiği tespit edilmiştir. Böylece Milliyetçilerin, yeni Türk Devleti'nin ve Türk halkının tek ve meşru temsilcisi olduğunu ispat ettikleri ortaya çıkmıştır.

Bu çalışma temel olarak dönemin en etkili basın-yayın organları; İstanbul ve Anadolu'da yayınlanan Osmanlıca gazeteler üzerinde oluşturulmuştur. Bu birinci el kaynakların dışında, dönemin olayları içinde bizzat bulunmuş şahısların, başta Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, İsmet İnönü, Kazım Karabekir, Ali Fuat Cebesoy ve Rauf Orbay gibi dönemin önemli simalarının anılarından yeterince istifade edilmiştir. Hatıratlar haricinde kalan ve İstanbul ile Ankara arasındaki ilişkilere ışık tutabilecek diğer çeşitli telif kaynaklar da bu çalışmanın hazırlanmasında etkili olmuştur. Buradaki telif eserlerin her biri, çalışmamızın temel kaynaklarını oluşturan gazetelerin konuları birbirine bağlamada yetersiz kaldığı noktalarda ve bazı boşlukları tamamlamak için kullanılmıştır.

Giriş ve sonuç bölümleri hariç toplamda üç temel bölümden oluşan bu çalışmanın ilk bölümünde birinci el kaynaklar olan hem de tezimizin temel kaynaklarını oluşturan ve dönemin kitle-iletişim araçları olan gazeteler tanıtılmıştır. Dönemin basını İstanbul ve Anadolu'da yayınlanan gazeteler olmak üzere iki ayrı kısımda incelenmiştir; İstanbul basını ise siyasi eğilimlerine göre milliyetçi ve milliyetçi karşıtı

basın olarak iki ayrı başlıkta tasnif edilmiştir. Bu bağlamda, yayınlanma tarihine göre sıralanan *İkdam*, *İfham*, *Tasvir-i Efkâr*, *Vakit*, *İleri*, *Yeni Gün*, *Akşam* ve *Hadisat* milliyetçi gazeteler olarak incelenmiştir. Milli harekete karşı olan gazeteler olarak da *Türkçe İstanbul*, *Alemdar* ve *Peyam-ı Sabah* ele alınmıştır. Anadolu basını ise yine yayın sırasına göre, *Öğüt*, *Albayrak*, *Açıksöz*, *İrade-i Milliye*, *İzmir'e Doğru* ve *Hâkimiyet-i Milliye* gibi sadece milli hareketi destekleyen gazetelerden müteşekkil halde ele alınmıştır. Anadolu'da yayınlanan milliyetçi karşıtı gazeteler de mevcut olmasına rağmen bunlar çalışmaya dâhil edilmedi. Mili Mücadele'ye karşıtlığı ile ünlü gazetelerin - Sofizade Mehmet Tevfik tarafından Kastamonu'da yayınlanan *Zafer*, Ali İlmi tarafından Adana'da yayınlanan *Ferda* ve Ömer Fevzi tarafından Balıkesir'de yayınlanan *İrşad* - bu çalışmada kullanılacak yeterli miktarda nüshalarına erişilmesi mümkün olmamıştır. Yani Anadolu'daki milli direnişe muhalefet eden gazetelerin nüshaların birçoğu ya kaybolmuş ya da yangınlarda yok olmuştur. Ayrıca, arşivlerde mevcut nüshalar ise konular arasında bağlantı oluşturmak konusunda son derece yetersiz kalmaktadır.

İstanbul ve Anadolu'da yayınlanan muhalif veya yandaş gazetelerin hepsi dönemin en etkili ve en yüksek tiraja sahip gazetelerdir. Fakat yayınlanma koşullarına bakıldığında, İstanbul basını ile Anadolu basınının eşit imkânlarla sahip olduğu söylenemez. Bu anlamda İstanbul basını çok daha iyi koşullarda yayınlar yapıyordu ve basım araçları Anadolu'dakilere oranla çok daha ileri düzey teknolojik makinelerdi. Ayrıca İstanbul basım evlerinin çoğunun gazete kâğıdı ve mürekkep eksikliği veya mürettip arayışı gibi teknik malzeme ve eleman problemleri yoktu. Bu nedenle İstanbul gazetelerinin hepsi günlük olarak yayınlanma olanağı bulmuştur. İstanbul basını tüm bu olanakların yanında bazı dezavantajlara da sahipti. İstanbul gazetelerinin hepsi hem Osmanlı Hükümeti'nin hem de İtilaf Devletleri'nin baskısı ve sansürü altındaydılar. Her an denetim altında oldukları için rahat bir yayın özgürlüğünden yoksundular. Anadolu basınına baktığımızda, Anadolu gazeteleri tüm bu olanaklardan yoksundu. Gazete kâğıdı ve mürekkep yokluğu ya da baskı makinelerinin teknik yetersizliği nedeniyle gazeteler yayın yapmakta zorlanıyordu. Anadolu'daki gazetelerin basıldığı ortam atıl vaziyette kalmış kulübe görünümlü son derece elverişsiz mekânlardı. Bu kısıtlı imkânlarla ve yokluklar nedeniyle Anadolu gazetelerinin çoğu ya haftada iki defa ya da bir defa yayın yapabildiği. Ancak,

Milli direnişin güçlenip askeri zaferlerle kendini ispatlamasından sonra Anadolu basını göreceli olarak daha rahat bir yayın ortamına sahip olmuşlardır. Anadolu basını için olumlu taraflardan biri de sansür ve baskı ortamında bulunmamalarıdır. İstanbul basınının tersine, Anadolu basını daha özgür bir yayın hayatına sahipti.

19. yüzyılın son çeyreğinde İtalya ve Almanya'nın siyaseten birliklerini sağlayıp Avrupa devletleri arasına yeni güç olarak katılmaları, güç dengelerini değiştirmişti. Bu iki devletin sömürge yarışına katılarak İngiltere ve Fransa'ya rakip olarak ortaya çıkması Avrupa'da kutuplaşmalar meydana getirmiştir. Bu kutuplaşmalar nihayetinde 1914 yılında bir dünya savaşının patlamasına zemin hazırlamıştır. Osmanlı İmparatorluğu ise İngiltere, Fransa ve Rusya'nın oluşturduğu İtilaf Bloğuna rakip olarak savaşa girmiş, fakat Birinci Dünya Savaşı'nda yenilmişti. Osmanlı İmparatorluğu, 30 Ekim 1918 yılında İtilaf Devletleri ile silahlı çatışmayı bitiren Mondros Ateşkes Antlaşması imzalamak zorunda kalmıştır. Ateşkes hükümleri ülkenin siyasi, ekonomik ve askeri kaderini düşman kuvvetlerinin eline terk etmişti. Mondros Mütarekesi'nin imzalanmasının hemen akabinde İtilaf Devletleri, kendilerince stratejik nokta olarak düşündükleri çeşitli bölgeleri ateşkesin 7. Maddesine dayanarak işgal etmişlerdi. Anadolu cehennemi andıran bir yer olmuştu. Tüm Osmanlı devlet adamları gibi İstanbul'da yayınlanan ve sonradan milli hareketi destekleyecek son derece etkili ve tirajı yüksek gazeteler ile milli harekete karşı çıkacak gazeteler derin bir kararsızlık ve karamsarlık içine düşmüşlerdi. Mütareke Dönemi İstanbul'da yayınlanan Osmanlıca gazetelerin hemen hemen hepsi, ülkenin kurtuluşunun tek yolunun, Amerika veya İngiltere gibi büyük bir devletin himayesine girmesiyle mümkün olduğunu düşünüyorlardı. Bu gazetelerden *İkdam*, *Tasvir-i Efkâr* ve *İfham* gibi gazeteler Amerikan mandasını savunurken, *Alemdar*, *Türkçe İstanbul* ve *Peyam- Sabah* gibi Hürriyet ve İtilaf Partisi'ni destekleyen gazeteler İngiliz himayesini savunuyorlardı. Mütarekenin imzalanmasından sonra, Amerikan ve İngiliz himayesini savunan gazeteler arasında müthiş bir çatışma yaşanmaya başlamıştır. Yabancı himayesini düşünen basın, imzalanan sulh muahedesinin ülkeyi zaten parçalayacağını iddia ediyorlardı. Bu nedenle Amerikan ya da İngiliz himayesi altına girerek ülkenin birlik ve bütünlüğünün korunacağını düşünmekteydiler. Ancak, yabancı bir devlet himayesinin asıl amacı Türkleri tutsak haline getirip ölüme mahkûm etmek demektir. Bu dönemde Anadolu basınından bahsetmek mümkün

görünmüyor çünkü Anadolu gazetelerinin hemen hemen hepsi ya Milli Mücadelenin başlaması ile birlikte ya da ondan daha sonraki bir dönemde yayınlanmaya başlamıştır.

Bu çalışmanın ikinci temel bölümünde Milli Mücadelenin başlamasından sonra İstanbul ile Anadolu arasında meydana gelen dini, siyasi ve hukuki çatışmalar üzerinde durulmuştur. Bu bölüm genel olarak, Ankara'daki Türk Milliyetçilerinin İstanbul hükümetlerine karşı dinihukuki meşruiyetini nasıl sağladığı ele alınmıştır.

Milli Mücadele'nin başlamasında en etkili olan gelişme şüphesiz İzmir'in Yunanlılar tarafından işgal edilmesidir. Basında çıkan haberler, İtilaf Devletleri'nin, yüzyıllardır Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun tebaası olan Yunanlılara İzmir'i işgal ettirerek Türk halkını küçük düşürdüğü ve hakaret ettiğini yazmışlardır. Ayrıca, yangına benzin dökmek olan İzmir'in Yunanlılarca işgal edilmesi, gazeteler tarafından Wilson Prensiplerinin ve özellikle 12. maddesinin ihlal edildiği şeklinde yorumlanmıştır. Basın, büyük çoğunluğu Türk olan bir bölgeyi azınlık halindeki Rumların idaresine teslim etmenin Avrupa medeniyetinin adalet anlayışına sığmayacağını vurguluyordu. Tüm bu haberlerden başka, Osmanlıca gazetelere yansıyan Fransız basınının haberlerine göre İzmir'in Yunanlılarca işgali kabul edilemezdi ve bu işgal bölgedeki Fransız ve Amerikan Ticaret Odalarının zarar etmesine neden olabilirdi. Fransız basınına göre, Yunanistan'ı siyasi ve ekonomik buhrandan kurtaramayan Atina Hükümeti, İzmir gibi sınırlarından uzak bir bölgeyi idareye muktedir olamazdı. Bu şartlar altında İzmir'in Yunan idaresine devredilmesi, özellikle bölgede daha çok menfaatleri bulunan Fransa'nın çıkarlarına zarar verecekti.

Mütarekesi hükümlerini kabul edilemez bulan Mustafa Kemal Paşa, haksız işgallere karşı mücadele etmek için 19 Mayıs 1919'da Samsun'a çıkmış ve Milli Mücadele hareketinin ilk fitilini ateşlemiştir. Havza'dan sonra Anadolu'da düzenlenen kongreler, Milli Mücadele hareketinin rotasını belirlemiştir. Mustafa Kemal Paşa, Milli direniş hareketi ile Türk halkının hiçbir ülkenin boyunduruğu altında olmadan bağımsız bir şekilde yaşama arzusunu dile getirmiştir. İlerleyen süreçte işgallere karşı direnen yerel örgütler ortaya çıkmıştır. Bu milli kuvvetler Türk milletinin ve vatanın bağımsızlığını ve bütünlüğünü savunmaya başladılar. Ankara meşruiyetini sağlamlaştırmadan önce ortaya çıkan yerel direniş örgütleri, Türk milletinin azmi ve

cesaretinin simgeleridir. Bu örgütler, kendi aralarında kongreler yaparak, asker toplayarak, bir anda küçük yerel idareler kuran kongreler, cumhuriyetin ve geleceğin siyasal tercihinin başlangıcını oluşturmuşlardır. İstanbul'da bu olayların duyulmasına izin verilmezken, Anadolu basını tüm gelişmeleri sütunlarında haber olarak Türk halkına duyuruyor, onları Kuva-yı Milliye'ye destek vermeleri için çağrıda bulunuyordu.

Bu dönemde basında yabancı himayesi tartışmaları devam etmişti ama yerel direniş örgütlerinin gerilla savaşları bir süreliğine de olsa düşmanı durdurmayı başarması bir kısım basının takdirini celp etmişti. Bundan sonraki süreçte, daha önce yabancı himayesini isteyen İkdam, Tasvir-i Efkâr ve İfham gibi gazeteler Millî Mücadele'yi desteklemeye başlamışlardı. Fakat Damat Ferit Paşa kabinesinin ve İtilaf Devletleri'nin baskıcı uygulamaları ve şiddetli sansür nedeniyle milliyetçi veya milliyetçi karşıtı gazeteler Kuva-yı Milliye ve milli direniş örgütleri hakkında, Sivas Kongresi'nin başlarına kadar haber yayımlayamamışlardır. Anadolu gazetelerini postanelerde saklı tutan Ferit Paşa kabinesi Sivas Kongresi'ni engelleyemediği için istifa etmek zorunda kalmıştır.

Bu tarihten sonra İstanbul ve Anadolu basını arasındaki çatışma şiddetlenmiş ve Anadolu'da başlayan milli direniş hakkındaki ilk görüş farklılıkları gazeteler üzerinde gerçekleşmiştir. İstanbul Hükümet'i taraftarı İstanbul basını, Millî Mücadele'nin çılgınlık ve çetecilik olduğunu iddia etmekte ve Millî Mücadele'yi küçümsemektedirler. Milliyetçi karşıtı gazeteler, özellikle İngiliz basınından aldıkları haberler yer vererek Anadolu direnişinin muvaffak olamayacağını iddia etmekteydiler. Onlara göre, Osmanlı İmparatorluğu, Birinci Dünya Savaşı'nda güçlü Almanya'dan birçok destek almış ve iki milyona yakın asker çıkarmış olmasına rağmen yine de yenilmişti. Şimdi dört bir tarafı ile bağlantısı kesilmiş ve içeriden de işgal edilmiş olan Anadolu'nun büyük güçlere karşı galip gelmesi mümkün değildi. Aynı zamanda bu gazeteler Millî Mücadele'yi destekleyen gazeteler için kötümser bir tavır takınmaktadırlar. İstanbul hükümetlerini destekleyenler, işgal altındaki bölgelerdeki işbirlikçiler ve İstanbul ve Anadolu'da manda taraftarı fikirler, bu gazetelerin sütunlarında yer bulmuşlardır. Ayrıca, İstanbul taraftarı gazeteler Kuva-yı milliye'yi nizamı bozan çeteler, halkın malını gaspeden haydutlar olarak

tanımlamışlardır. Ankara Hükümeti, muhalif gazetelerin yayınlarının sansür ve kısıtlamalar uygulayarak Anadolu'ya girmesini engellemiştir. İstanbul ve Anadolu'da yayınlanan Milliyetçi gazeteler ise Millî Mücadele'yi desteklemişler ve milli direniş hareketini Türk milletinin son derece meşru müdafaa hareketi olarak yorumlamışlardır. Bu gazeteler, Kuvay-ı Milliye'yi Türk halkının bağımsız yaşama idealininin yegâne savunucuları olduğunu savunmuşlardır. Milliyetçi gazeteler, ortak düşmana karşı halkı, bilinçlendirme ve propaganda ile bütünleştirme konusunda önemli bir görevi yerine getirmişlerdir. Anadolu gazeteleri son derece iptidai koşullarda yayınlarını sürdürmelerine rağmen Anadolu direnişini yürekten desteklemişler ve milletin bağımsızlığı ve ülkenin bütünlüğün için tam bir inanç ve özveri ile en az askerler kadar şanlı bir mücadele örneği sergilemişlerdir.

Anadolu direnişini savunan yayınlarından dolayı Milliyetçi basın hem İtilaf devletleri hem de İstanbul Hükümeti tarafından ağır sansüre tabi tutulmuştur. Anadolu'da işgal altındaki bölgelerde yayın yapan gazeteler ve özellikle İstanbul gazeteleri yoğun baskı nedeniyle bazen sayfaları boş olarak yayınlanmıştır. Bu gazeteler baskı nedeniyle ya yayın hayatlarını sonlandırmışlar ya da Anadolu'daki güvenli bölgelere taşınmışlardır. Anadolu gazeteler bu konuda daha şanslıydılar çünkü onlar özgür bir yayın ortamına sahiptiler. Ayrıca Mustafa Kemal Paşa, halkı milli mücadele etrafında birleştirmek, olaylar hakkında bilinçlendirmek ve dünya kamuoyunun milli hareket hakkındaki düşüncelerini takip edebilmek için Matbuat ve İstihbarat Müdürlüğü ve Anadolu Ajansı'nı kurmuştur. Bu iki kurum istihbarattan, halkı bilgilendirmeye, gazetelerin dış haberlerinin tedarikinden, yabancı gazetelerde çıkan haberlerin çevrilmesine ve gerekli yerlerde sansür uygulamaya kadar birçok konuda gazetelere yardımcı olmuşlardır.

4-11 Eylül 1919 tarihleri arasında düzenlenen Sivas Kongresi'nden sonra Damat Ferit Paşa Kabinesi daha fazla iktidarda tutunamamış ve 1 Ekim 1919 tarihinde istifa etmek zorunda kaldı. Milliyetçi basın, özellikle Anadolu basını bu istifayı büyük bir memnuniyetle karşılamıştır. Gazeteler bu olayı, milliyetçilerin büyük bir zaferi olarak sayfalarında neşretmişlerdir. Yeni kurulacak hükümetin de Anadolu ile uzlaşabilecek vatanperver şahıslardan oluşmasını temenni etmekteydiler. Bu temenniler gerçekleşmişti ve Türk Milliyetçileri ile ılımlı ilişkiler kuracak olan Ali

Rıza Paşa yeni hükümeti 2 Ekim 1919 tarihinde kurmuştu. 20-22 Ekim 1919 yılında Türk Milliyetçileri ile İstanbul'daki Ali Rıza Paşa Hükümeti'nin temsilcisi Salih Paşa arasında Amasya'da gerçekleştirilen görüşmeler, İstanbul'daki milliyetçi basın tarafında son derece olumlu yorumlanmıştır. Milliyetçi gazeteler, İstanbul Hükümeti'nin milli hareketin önderleri Amasya'da uzlaştığını ve aradaki buzların eridiğini yazmışlardı. Ayrıca, milli direniş hareketinin Türk milletinin vicdanından doğduğunu belirten milliyetçi gazeteler, Kuva-yı Milliye'nin ve önderlerinin İstanbul Hükümeti tarafından resmen tanındığı şeklinde yayınlara yer vermişlerdir. Milliyetçi karşıtı basın ise milliyetçileri hala gayri meşru çeteler, haydutlar ve İttihat ve Terakki'nin bakiyeleri olarak tasvir etmeye devam etmişlerdi.

Amasya'daki görüşmelerde seçimlerin yapılıp İstanbul'daki Meclis-i Mebusan'ın bir an evvel açılması konusunda anlaşmaya varılmıştı. Seçim çalışmaları hemen başlatılmıştı. Seçimlerin sürerken, milliyetçi karşıtı basın Anadolu'daki İttihatçıların, yani milliyetçilerin seçimlere müdahale ettiğinden ve her yerde İttihatçı adayların milletvekili seçildiğinden şikâyet ediyordu. Hürriyet ve İtilaf Partisi'ni de destekleyen milli harekete muhalif gazeteler, bu şartlar altında seçimin adil ve meşru olmadığını vurguluyorlardı. 1919 yılının sonuna doğru seçimler tamamlanmıştı. Mustafa Kemal Erzurum'dan, Rauf Bey İstanbul'dan, Celalettin Arif Bey Erzurum'dan milletvekili seçilmişlerdi. Milletvekilleri İstanbul'a ulaşmışlar ve 12 Ocak 1920 yılında halk iradesinin merkezi olan Osmanlı Mebusan Meclisi açılmıştı. Bu son meclisin ülke için yaptığı son faydalı icraat, yeni Türk Devletinin sınırlarını ve dış politikada takip edeceği prensipleri belirleyen Misak-ı Milli'yi meclisten geçirmesiydi. Diğer bir ifadeyle, Misak-ı Milli yeni Türk halkının, kalıcı bir barışın sağlanabilmesi ve Doğu'da asayişin tekrar uygulanması için asgari şartlarını içeriyordu.

Misak-ı Milli'nin Osmanlı Mebusan Meclisi'nde onaylanması ve Anadolu'daki Kuva-yı Milliye'yi kınamaması nedeniyle İtilaf Devletleri Ali Rıza Paşa Hükümeti'ni baskı altına aldılar. Bu nedenle Ali Rıza Paşa 3 Mart 1920'de istifa etmek zorunda kaldı. Milliyetçi karşıtı basın tekrar Damat Ferit Paşa'nın iktidara gelmesini isterken, Padişah hükümeti kurma görevini Salih Paşa'ya verdi ve Paşa 6 Mart 1920 tarihinde, Mondros Mütarekesi'nden beri İstanbul'daki beşinci Osmanlı hükümetini kurmuş

oldu. Milliyetçi gazeteler hükümeti Salih Paşa'nın kurmasını İstanbul'un Ankara ile bağları koparmak istemediği ve uzlaşmaya devam etmek istediği şeklinde yorumlamışlardı.

Ankara'daki Türk Milliyetçilerinin hukuki anlamda meşruluğunun zeminini hazırlayan 16 Mart 1920 yılında İstanbul'un İtilaf kuvvetleri tarafından resmen işgali milliyetçi karşıtı basın ve milliyetçi basın tarafından farklı bakış açısıyla değerlendirilmiştir. İstanbul'da yayınlanan Türkçe İstanbul, Alemdar ve Peyam-ı Sabah gibi gazeteler, resmi işgalden Mustafa Kemal Paşa ve etrafındaki Milli Mücadele hareketinin önderlerini sorumlu tutmuştur. Muhalif gazetelere göre milli direniş hareketinin önderleri Anadolu'da çıkardıkları fitne ve fesat nedeniyle İngilizlerin tepkisini çektiler ve İstanbul'un işgaline zemin hazırlamışlardı. Bu nedenle işgalden dolayı tek suçlu varsa onlar da kendilerini milliyetperver olarak tanımlayan "İttihatçılardı". İstanbul'da yayınlanan milli hareket taraftarı gazetelerin yayınlarına bakıldığında, İstanbul'un İtilaf kuvvetlerince resmen işgali olağanüstü bir durum olarak görülmedi. Çünkü İstanbul 16 aydan beri zaten fiili işgal altındaydı. Dolayısıyla bu gazeteler resmi işgali normal bir olay olarak karşıladılar ve aşırı tepki göstermediler.

Anadolu'da yayınlanan milli direniş taraftarı gazeteler İstanbul'un işgalini daha tantanalı ve süslü üsluplar ile karşıladılar. Anadolu basını İstanbul'un işgalini İngiltere'nin, Fransa'nın özellikle Maraş olayları nedeniyle Güneydoğu Anadolu'daki başarısızlıklarını telafi etmek niyetiyle yaptığını yazmıştır. Yani İngiltere başkentte sıkı bir denetim sağlayarak Anadolu'daki milli direnişin de etkisini kırmak istiyordu. Bu iddialardan başka, Anadolu'daki gazeteler İstanbul'un resmen işgalini İngilizlerin doğu politikalarına bağlamaktadır. Bu gazetelerin yayınlarının büyük çoğunluğuna göre İngiltere, İstanbul'u işgal edip PadişahHalifeyi esir alarak doğu sömürgelerindeki Müslüman nüfusun hareketlerini kontrol altında tutmaya çalışmaktadır. Böylece İngiltere, Türkiye'yi Ortadoğu'nun "yeni Mısır'ı" haline getirmeyi planlamaktadır. Yine Anadolu basınına göre, İngilizler Anadolu halkının ve diğer Müslüman milletlerin tepkisini izole etmek için İstanbul'un işgalinden Padişah-Halife Sultan Vahdettin'in bile memnun olduğunu duyurmuşlardı.

Özellikle Anadolu'daki milliyetçi basın, İstanbul'un işgalini Ankara'da açılacak yeni meclisin meşruiyeti açısından olumlu bir şekilde değerlendirmiştir. Gazetelere göre, İstanbul'un işgal edilmesi, Padişah-Halife'nin esir alınması ve Meclis-i Mebusan'ın dağılarak mebusların sürgüne gönderilmesi, ülkeyi karar alma merciinden mahrum bırakmıştı. Bu şartlar altında işgal altındaki İstanbul'da bulunan hükümetin aldığı kararların hiçbir hükmü kalmamıştı. Zaten Hükümet aldığı kararları Anadolu'da uygulama gücünden yoksundu. Dolayısıyla Türk milletini yönlendirecek yeni bir otorite gerekiyordu. Ankara'da Büyük Millet Meclisi'nin açılmasıyla birlikte Mustafa Kemal Paşa etrafında toplanan Millî Mücadele'nin etkin kadrosu, hem siyasal hem de askerî açıdan yönetimi ele almışlardır. Ankara, milliyetçiler hakkında idam hükmü veren İstanbul ile haberleşmesini kesmiş, iktidarını genişletmek ve sağlamlaştırmak için kanunlar çıkartmıştır. Meclis, olağanüstü duruma uygun olarak Teşkilat ı Esasiye (20 Ocak 1921) adında bir anayasa hazırlamıştır. Bunlardan başka meclis, vatan hainlerini yargılamak üzere İstiklal Mahkemeleri kurarak iktidarını pekiştirmiştir. Milli Mücadele döneminde etkin olan vatanperver bir entelektüel olan Halide Edip Hanım'ın da vurguladığı gibi İstanbul'un işgali aslında Ankara'nın hukuki meşruiyetini kurması ve güçlendirmesi açısından son derece önemli bir gelişmedir. Onun kanaatine göre "İtilaf Devletleri İstanbul'da şiddeti artırarak milli hareketin prestijini artırdılar."

İstanbul'un resmen işgalinden sonra artan baskılar nedeniyle Salih Paşa Kabinesi 2 Nisan 1920'de istifasını sunmak zorunda kaldı. İtilaf Devletleri, özellikle İngiltere, Ankara'daki milliyetçileri kınamayı vadeden Damat Ferit Paşa'nın göreve getirilmesi için Padişah Vahdettin'e baskı kurdular. Bu baskı nedeniyle Padişah yeni kabineyi kurma görevini Damat Ferit Paşa'ya tevdi etti. Böylece Damat Ferit 4 Nisan 1920 yılında kendisinin dördüncü, İstanbul'un ise altıncı hükümetini kurmuş oldu. İstanbul'daki milliyetçi basın, Ferit Paşa'nın iktidara gelmesi hakkında yoğun baskı nedeniyle ses çıkaramamıştı. Milliyetçi karşıtı gazeteler ise Damat Ferit'e övgüler düzmüşler ve onun Köprülü Mehmet Paşa gibi sert, Kuyucu Murat Paşa gibi tasfiyeci ve Sokullu Mehmet Paşa gibi ileri görüşlü biri olduğunu yazmışlardır. Ayrıca bu gazeteler Ferit Paşa'nın milliyetçilere karşı son derece amansız hareket etmesini salık vermişlerdir.

Damat Ferit Paşa sözünü tutmuş ve 5 Nisan 1920 tarihinde, İngilizlerin istekleri doğrultusunda hareket ederek milliyetçileri kınayan, onları yok sayan ve Kuva-yı Milliye'yi halkın gözünde itibarsızlaştırmayı amaçlayan bir beyanname yayınlamıştır. Bununla yetinmeyen Ferit Paşa yine İngilizlerin isteği üzerine Şeyhülislam Dürrizade Abdullah Efendi'den milliyetçileri kınayan, itibarsızlaştıran ve milli direniş hareketini de dinen gayri meşru ilan eden bir fetva almıştır. Milli Mücadele'ye karşı muhalefet eden gazeteler, İstanbul Hükümeti'nin Şeyhülislam'dan aldığı fetvayı sütunlarında yayınlamışlar ve fetvanın içeriğini destekleyen makaleler ile merkezi hükümetin haklı olduğunu ve milli hareketin ise dinen bir geçerliliğinin olmadığını savunmuşlardır. Muhalif gazeteler fetvaya dayanarak, milliyetçileri Padişaha karşı gelen asiler ve çeteler, milli direnişi de ülkeyi kana bulayan eşkiyalık ve çetecilik olarak tasvir etmişlerdir. Ayrıca, Padişah-Halifeye karşı gelen milliyetçilerin katledilmelerinin dinen farz olduğunu ilan etmişlerdir. Türk halkın dini hassasiyetlerinin ve manevi değerlerinin farkında olan Mustafa Kemâl Paşa ve çevresindekiler de İstanbul'un fetvasına yine bir fetva ile karşılık vermişlerdir. Milliyetçi gazeteler de Ankara Hükümeti'nin Mehmet Rifat Efendi ve bir grup müftünün de imzaladığı fetvayı yayınlamışlar ve milli direniş hareketinin, düşmanın elinde esir durumuna düşen Padişahı-Halifeyi kurtarmayı hedeflediğini belirtmişlerdir. Ayrıca milliyetçilerin asiler olmadığını, milleti ve ülkeyi düşmanın zulüm ve işgalinden kurtararak bağımsızlığına kavuşturmaya çalışan vatanperverler olduklarını vurgulamışlardır. Milliyetçi basın Ankara'nın fetvasına arka çıkarak bütün milletin Anadolu'da başlayan bu meşru müdafaa hareketine katılmasının dini bir vecibe olduğunu vurgulamıştır. Ayrıca haberlere göre milliyetçiler vatanın bütünlüğü ve bağımsızlığı, Padişah- Halife'nin esaretten kurtarılması gibi mukaddes amaçlara hizmet etmekteydiler. Bu gazeteler Anadolu'da başlayan milli direniş hareketi dini açıdan son derece meşru bir hareket olarak görmekteydiler. Özellikle Anadolu'daki milliyetçi basın milli hareketin dini meşruiyetine atıfta bulunarak toplumsal dayanışmayı ve bütünleşmeyi sağlamak ve halkın desteğini elde etmek için büyük çaba sarf etmişti. Bunlardan başka, Anadolu'daki gazeteler İstanbul Hükümeti'nin fetvasının geçerli olmadığını çünkü o fetvanın İngilizlerin baskısı ve silah zoruyla alındığını ileri sürmüşlerdir. Esaret altındaki kurum ve şahıslardan çıkan bu fetvanın dinen bir hükmünün olmayacağı vurgulanmıştır.

Milli Mücadele basınının üzerinde durduğu önemli olaylardan biri de Bilecik Mülakatı idi. İstanbul Hükümeti'ni destekleyen gazeteler Bilecik Mülakatı'nı, İtilaf Devletleri'nin İstanbul Hükümeti aracılığıyla Ankara'ya uzattığı bir dost eli olarak yorumladılar. Bu gazeteler mülakatı, Ankara'nın İtilaf Devletleri ile anlaşabilmesi için verilen son şans olarak değerlendirdiler. Milliyetçi gazetelere göre ise Bilecik Mülakatı siyasi bir hamleydi. İtilaflar bir idam fermanı olan Sevres Antlaşması'nda bazı değişiklikler yaparak bu anlaşmayı Ankara Hükümeti'ne kabul ettirebileceklerini düşünüyorlardı. İtilaf Devletleri, hiçbir mücadele vermeden asi general olarak ilan edilen Mustafa Kemal Paşa ile Bilecik'te anlaşarak Ankara'yı kontrol altına almayı hedefliyorlardı. Fakat Mustafa Kemal Paşa Sevres Anlaşması'nda değişiklik yapılmasını değil, tamamen yok edilmesini hedefliyordu. İstanbul ve Anadolu'daki milliyetçi basın, Sevr Anlaşması'nın onaylanması için İtilaf Devletleri'nin Ankara Hükümeti'ni tanımak zorunda kaldıklarını ve bundan sonraki süreçte de dikkate almaları gereken bir güç olduğunu aktarıyordu.

Ankara Hükümeti'ni İtilaf devletleri ile karşı karşıya getiren ve Sevr Barış Antlaşması ile dayatılan iki önemli sorun vardı. Bunlardan biri İzmir'in Yunan idaresine devredilmesi, diğeri ise Doğu Anadolu'da Erzurum, Van, Elazığ, Bitlis, Diyarbakır ve Sivas illerini de kapsayan Büyük Ermenistan Devleti'nin kurulmasıydı. Ankara Hükümeti'nin bu iki önemli meselede gösterdiği direniş, ilerleyen süreçte İtilaf Devletleri'ni Ankara'yı siyasi bir güç olarak resmen tanımalarına mecbur etmiştir. Milliyetçiler, İtilaf Devletleri'nin Sevres projesiyle teyit ettikleri bu planlarına boyun eğmemiş ve bu uğurda batıda İtilafların maşası olan Ermenilerle Doğu'da ve Yunanlılarla Batı'da savaşmıştır. Ankara Hükümeti Ermenilere karşı kazandığı askeri başarılar sonucunda Kars ili Ermenilerden geri almıştır. Ermenilerin isteği üzerine 2-3 Aralık 1920'de Gümrü Antlaşması imzalanarak Doğu'daki sorun bertaraf edilmiş ve sınır güvenliği sağlanmıştır. Ankara Hükümeti, Batı Anadolu'da Yunanlılara karşı zorlu mücadeleler vermişti. Bu olağanüstü gayretler sayesinde, İnönü savaşları, Sakarya zaferi ve en sonunda da Büyük Taarruz büyük askeri zaferler elde edilmiş ve Yunanlılar hezimete uğratılmıştır. Türk ordusunun sahada kazandığı askeri zaferler, Ankara Hükümeti'nin hem İstanbul Hükümeti'ne karşı hem de İtilaf Devletlerine karşı kendi otoritesini sağlamlaştırma olanağı vermiştir. Ankara'nın askeri başarıları karşısında muhalif

basının sesi kesilmişti ve onların bu sükûtu aslında Ankara'yı onaylamak anlamına geliyordu. Milliyetçi basın da Türk ordusunun şanlı zaferlerini âdeta haykırmişti.

Milliyetçi gazeteler, askeri zaferlerin diplomatik başarıları da beraberinde getirdiğini ve Ankara Hükümeti'nin Türk milletinin tek yetkili temsilcisi olduğunu belirtmişlerdir. Bu gazeteler, Ermenilerle yapılan Gümrü Antlaşması (2-3 Aralık 1920), Sovyetlerle imzalanan Moskova Dostluk Antlaşması, Fransızlarla imzalanan Ankara İtilafnamesi (20 Ekim 1921) ve son olarak İtilaf Devletleri temsilcileri imzalanan Mudanya Ateşkes Antlaşması (11 Ekim 1922) gibi diplomatik gelişmelerin, Ankara Hükümeti'nin uluslararası alandaki meşruiyetini teyit ettirdiğine dair yayınlar yapmışlardır. Bu arada Osmanlıca gazetelere yansıyan yabancı basındaki haberler de Türk Milli mücadelesinin meşruluğuna dair haberler yayınlamışlardı. İngiliz, Yunan ve Ermeni basını milli direnişin başarılarını hala kabullenememişlerdi. Fakat Millî Mücadeleyi Türk milletinin meşru müdafaa hareketi olarak yorumlayan İtalyan ve özellikle Fransız basını, diplomatik başarılarla kendisini uluslararası alanda kabul ettiren Ankara Hükümeti'ni Türk halkının meşru temsilcisi olarak kabul etmişlerdir.

Çalışmanın sonunda ulaştığımız çıkarımları şu şekilde sıralamamız mümkündür. Bu çalışmayla birlikte görüldü ki milli mücadele döneminde hem İstanbul hem de Anadolu'daki milliyetçi basın propaganda yaparak halkı milli direniş için kanalize etme konusunda müthiş bir çaba sarf etmiştir. Fakat İstanbul basınının propaganda ve halkı etkileme konusunda Anadolu basınına oranla daha başarılı olduğunu itiraf etmek durumundayız. İstanbul'da halkın, gazetecilerin ve bilumum aydınların entelektüel seviyesi çok daha yüksekti. Dış dünya ile sürekli etkileşim halindeydiler ve dünyada ne olup bittiğini çok iyi takip ediyorlardı.

Anadolu basını İstanbul kadar şanslı değildi. Anadolu halkının okuryazarlığı çok düşük ve halkın büyük çoğunluğu köylerde yoksulluk içinde yaşıyordu. Anadolu insanı, entelektüel faaliyetlerden ziyade gündelik geçimini temin etmekle meşguldü. Anadolu gazetelerinin yayınlarına bakıldığında görülecektir ki gazetelerde çoğunlukla resmi bildirimler, beyannameler ve açıklamalar yayınlanmıştır. Anadolu basını, Milli hareketin önderlerinin elinde propaganda aracı olmaktan öteye gidememiştir. Gazetelerin kullandığı diplomatik dil bu iddiayı doğrulamaktadır.

Anadolu'daki gazetelerin halkı etkilemeye çalıştığı ve milli mücadele katılması için verdiği mücadele yadsınamaz fakat bu konuda çok da başarılı olduğunu söylemek mümkün değildir. Anadolu halkının milli mücadele iştirak etmesindeki en önemli faktör “din” ve “dini söylem” idi. Anadolu halkı, yüzyıllardır kutsal saydığı ve dini ve siyasi olarak tek otorite kabul ettiği Padişah-Halifeyi düşman esaretinden kurtarmak niyetiyle bu harekete destek vermiştir. Yaptığımız çalışma, en azından Anadolu halkının, basındaki propagandanın tesiri ile milliyetçileri desteklediğini göstermemiştir. Resmi makamlar, halk adına ve halkın ağızıyla kaleme aldıkları telgraf ve beyannameleri neşrederek milli direnişi halka mal etmeye çalışmışlardır. Anadolu gazeteleri de o dönemde bu amaca hizmet edebilecek etkili bir araç idi.

Çalışmanın İstanbul ve Ankara arası ilişkiler bakımından ortaya çıkardığı diğer önemli bir sonuç ise İstanbul hükümetlerinin tutumuyla alakalıdır. İstanbul ve Anadolu basınında çıkan haber ve yorumlardan anlaşıldığı kadarıyla Damat Ferit Paşa tarafından kurulan hükümetler – Alemdar, Türkçe İstanbul ve Peyam-ı Sabah gibi üç milliyetçi karşıtı gazete hariç tutulursa - hiçbir zaman hoş karşılanmamıştır. Milli mücadele dönemi boyunca toplam beş kez iktidara gelen Damat Ferit Paşa Milli direnişe karşı çıkmış ve milliyetçilere karşı en sert tedbirlere başvurmuştur. Kısacası, İstanbul ile Ankara'nın en çok çatıştığı ve birbirine ters düştüğü dönemler, Damat Ferit Paşa'nın hükümetleri zamanına rastlamaktadır. Fakat yaklaşık dört seneyi kapsayan bütün Milli mücadele dönemi tarihi, bir buçuk süreyi işgal eden Damat Ferit Paşa kabinelerinden ibaret değildir. Bu dönemde kurulan Ali Rıza Pasa, Salih Paşa ve Tevfik Paşa hükümetleri basında her zaman memnuniyetle karşılanmıştır. Bu kabineler, Mondros Ateşkes hükümlerine karşı üstü kapalı bir şekilde direniş göstermiş ve İtilaf temsilcilerinin isteklerine muhalif tedbirler almaktan kaçınmamışlardır. Ayrıca bu hükümetler her zaman Anadolu'daki milliyetçilere karşı ılımlı politika takip etmişler ve onlarla uzlaşma yolunu tercih etmişlerdir. Yine gazetelerdeki haber ve yorumlarda da görüldüğü gibi Milli direnişe dair tüm olumlu gelişmeler ve haberler bu hükümetler zamanında vuku bulmuştur.

Bu çalışmada, dönemin Osmanlıca gazetelerine yansıdığı oranda yabancı basının Milli Mücadele hakkında bakış açısını da değerlendirme fırsatı yakaladık. İngiliz, Yunan ve Ermeni gazeteleri Milli direnişi derhal yok edilmesi gereken bir isyan

olarak nitelerken, İtalyan ve özellikle Fransız gazeteleri milliyetçileri Anadolu'daki tek yetkili siyasi ve askeri bir güç olarak gördükleri tespit edilmiştir. Milli hareketin bağımsız bir devlete doğru everildiğini iddia eden İtalyan ve Fransız kamuoylarının, Milliyetçileri Türk halkının tek meşru temsilcisi olarak kabul ettiği ortaya çıkmıştır. Bu durumda İngilizler, saltanatın temsilcisi olan İstanbul'u desteklerken, İtalya ve özellikle Fransa merkezi Ankara'da bulunan milli hükümeti desteklemişlerdir. Fransız basındaki haber ve yorumlardan da anlaşıldığı kadarıyla Fransa, İngilizlerin doğudaki başına buyruk politikalarına karşı çıkabilecek tek güç olarak Milliyetçileri görmekteydi.

Yine Osmanlıca gazetelere yansıyan yabancı haber ve yorumlamalarda ve yerel gazetelerde de bahsedildiği gibi Doğu'da barış ve huzurun sağlanması, Anadolu'da barışın ve asayişin sağlanmasına bağlıydı. Bilumum İtilaf Devletleri Ortadoğu'da istikrarı sağlayabilmeleri için bir an önce Türk barışını halletmeleri gerekiyordu. Görüldüğü üzere Anadolu bugün olduğu gibi, Milli Mücadele döneminde de Ortadoğu'daki en hassas ve kritik noktayı oluşturuyordu.

TEZ FOTOKOPİ İZİN FORMU / THESES PHOTOCOPY PERMISSION FORM

ENSTİTÜ / INSTITUTE

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Social Sciences

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Applied Mathematics

Enformatik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Informatics

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Marine Sciences

YAZARIN / AUTHOR

Soyadı / Surname :

Adı / Name :

Bölümü / Department:

TEZİN ADI / TITLE OF THE THESIS (İngilizce / English):

.....

.....

TEZİN TÜRÜ / DEGREE: Yüksek Lisans / Master Doktora / PhD

1. Tezimin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılsın ve kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla tezimin bir kısmı veya tamamının fotokopisi alınsın./Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide and photocopy whether all or part of my thesis providing that cited.
2. Tezimin tamamı yalnızca Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi kullanıcılarının erişimine açılsın. (Bu seçenekle tezinizin fotokopisi ya da elektronik kopyası Kütüphane aracılığı ile ODTÜ dışına dağıtılmayacaktır.)/Release the entire work for Middle East Technical University access only. (With this option your work will not be listed in any research sources, and no one outside METU will be able to provide both electronic and paper copies through the Library.)
3. Tezim bir (1) yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olsun. (Bu seçenekle tezinizin fotokopisi ya da elektronik kopyası Kütüphane aracılığı ile ODTÜ dışına dağıtılmayacaktır.)/Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of one year.

Yazarın imzası / Signature

Tarih / Date