

The Dissolution Of The Ottoman Empire And The Foundation Of Modern Turkey Under The Leadership Of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk

Necati Ulunay Ucuzsatar *

Abstract

By the end of "World War I", (1914-1918), because of the imperialist ambitions of the imperial European powers, the history of the globe perceived the dissolution, dismemberment and partition of a great empire named "Ottoman" which dominated a large part of the world for centuries. Despite prejudged aggressiveness and plans of imperialism to destroy the Turkish nation, after the dismemberment of Ottoman empire, the Turks won a remarkable victory in their heartland under the leadership of Mustafa Kemal against the Allied invaders and founded a democratic, secular, modern and contemporary Turkish republic based on the Atatürk's wisdom, principles, ideology and peaceful thoughts.

Özet

Birinci Dünya Savaşı (1914-1918) sonlarında, dünya tarihi, sömürgeci Avrupa güçlerinin emperyalist hırsları nedeniyle "Osmanlı" adıyla anılan yüzyıllarca yeryüzünün büyük bir kısmında egemen olmuş bir büyük imparatorluğun dağılmasını, parçalanmasını ve paylaşılmasını idrak etti. Osmanlı İmparatorluğunun parçalanmasından sonra emperyalizmin Türk ulusunu yok etmek için önyargılı düşmanlığına ve planlarına rağmen, Türkler, Mustafa Kemal'in liderliğinde müttefik istilacılara karşı kendi vatanlarında büyük bir zafer kazandılar ve Atatürk'ün aklına, ilkelerine, ideolojisine ve barışçı düşüncelerine dayanan demokratik, laik, modern ve çağdaş bir Türkiye Cumhuriyeti kurdular.

Introduction

The Ottoman Empire was one of the most powerful empires in sixteenth and seventeenth century and the Turkish regime was dominant over a vast territory, including the Balkans, Anatolia, Caucasus, the Arab Middle East, Egypt and North Africa. The influence of the Turco-Ottomans reached the Mediterranean, the Aegean, the Black and the Red seas and even Inner Asia and the Sahara.

While the empire had faced with the loss of several wars and had gone through a period of decentralization in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries it had begun to give ground to its European political and commercial competitors by retaining its political legitimacy and its basic institutional structure. Despite the substantial reformation and restoration the power of central state, consolidation of control over the provinces and generation of the economic, social and cultural reforms by the expectation that make them more effective against their competitors in the world; the Ottomans had been weakened and the empire commenced slowly being dismembered because the European powers had overbalanced their early military, economic and technological advantages in the nineteenth century.

Between 1878 and 1914, most of the Balkan countries gained their independence and Russia, Britain and Austria-Hungary all threatened the Ottoman Empire to acquire direct control of its territories. As well known, the dismemberment of the Ottoman empire culminated at the end of World War I and paved the way the emergence of new states in Anatolia and the Arab Middle East.

Here we shall first examine the ambition and impact of the European powers, the dissolution of the Ottoman empire, and the military and political circumstances behind the new formations in Turkey. Then we shall discuss the transformation of the Ottoman empire to the new Turkish state and consider the revolution and modernization of the Republic of Turkey under the leadership of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk in the nineteenth century.

THE DISMEMBERMENT AND THE PARTITION OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE

By the end of the eighteenth century the world had witnessed the great developments and advances in science and technology and by ignoring the contemporary progress the Ottoman empire could no longer defend itself against the growing power of its basic European competitors. Russia had invaded the Crimea, started to dominate the northern territories of the Ottomans, and established itself on the Black Sea, while Britain, after helping defeat Napoleon's invasion of Egypt in 1798, became the unique commercial and military power in the Mediterranean. On the other hand, Russia also wanted to attain Ottoman territories in the Balkans and win free access to the Mediterranean; Britain wanted to shore up the empire as a bulwark against Russian expansion and protect its commercial and imperial interests in the Mediterranean, the Middle and, Far East. Thus, the Ottoman empire was precariously protected by the balance of European power, and by losing control of its imperial countries it had been started to be called as "sick man of Europe" for the nineteenth century-long struggle.

The Ottoman governor of Egypt Mehmet Ali (1805-48) became rebellious and declared himself dominant and independent after his invasion of Syria and the Ottomans concluded the Treaty of Hünkâr İskelesi in response the Mehmet Ali's rebellion in which they agreed to close the Dardenelles and Bosphorus to foreign warships in return for Russian support in 1833 . But, by being aware of her interests in the Mediterranean, Britain, declared for the territorial integrity of the Ottoman empire and the restoration of Syria to Ottoman control to prevent the Russian protectorate over the Ottomans and possible Russian and French intervention in the region [1]. In 1840, Russia, Britain, and Austria agreed that Mehmet Ali would have to retreat from Syria and framed a new convention regulating passage through the Turkish straits. They all made a new agreement on that no warships were to pass the Bosphorus and the Dardenelles in time of peace. Both Russia and Britain would be protected in their spheres of influence [2]. By a supplementary agreement in 1841, the powers allowed Mehmet Ali to establish a hereditary regime in Egypt. The rebellion of Mehmet Ali was an internal crisis of the Ottoman empire but led to a concert of European powers to regulate Ottoman internal affairs. This means, the first time in its history, The Ottoman empire had become a

protectorate and a pawn of European imperialism and its imperialist competitors.

The other European intervention occurred in the Crimean war (1854-56). Provoked by Russian demands for influence in Jerusalem and a protectorate over all Ottoman Christian subjects, Ottoman, French and British forces entered the Black Sea, attacked the Russian forces of the Crimean region and invaded Sevastopol in 1855. The Russian forces were defeated and by the Treaty of Paris (1856) the Russians were forced to dismantle their naval forces on the Black Sea, but they were compensated by an agreement to make Rumania an autonomous province under Ottoman suzerainty.

The next crisis was the revolt of Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1876 against Ottoman rule. Nationalist rebellion to Ottomans in the Balkans had started with the Serbian revolt of 1804-13. Between 1821 and 1829, with the political support of imperial powers, Greece gained its independence. Serbians, Rumanians, and Bulgarians also demanded autonomy. This event had been fostered and incentive reason of the Balkan campaigns and the campaigns for independence culminated in 1876 with Russian intervention. By the Treaty of San Stefano (1877), the Ottomans were forced to concede the independence of Serbia, Bulgaria, Montenegro, and Rumania. In this case, the other European powers couldn't endure huge Russian gains over Ottoman-Balkan territories and by being provoked under these political circumstances they called a Congress of European States at Berlin in 1878. [3] At this congress, as known as a famous agreement named "Berlin", a new settlement was imposed by the imperial European powers. Bessarabia was ceded by the Ottomans to Russia, but in compensation for Russian gains, Austria "temporarily" occupied Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Britain obtained the use of Cyprus as a strategic base for British operations. Bulgaria was reduced to a small size and Ottoman suzerainty was restored. Following Berlin Congress, in 1882, to protect her interests in the Suez Canal and in the Egyptian debt to British and other European bond holders, Britain occupied Egypt. That action had showed the change of British policy for the defense of the territorial integrity of the Ottoman empire to a new policy of partition its territories in order to maintain the European balance of power. Henceforth, "The Eastern Question" had been emerged and would be handled by the further dismemberment of the Ottoman state.

During the period of 1878 to 1908, the partition of the empire had not been possible because of the mutual rivalries of the European powers. While Britain was keeping its geostrategic position in Cyprus and Egypt, Germany established its influence by investing in Ottoman railroads and by sending military commanders and experts to train the Turkish troops of Ottoman army to the empire. But the main rivalries among the powers centered on the Balkans again. Austria managed to establish its diplomatic ascendancy over Serbia and good political relations with Rumania and Greece; Russia maintained its hegemony over Bulgaria while Serbia, Greece and Bulgaria, all were fighting for control of Macedonia.

The action of balance of European power was initiated by an Ottoman internal political crisis in 1908. Serbia, fostered and supported by Russia, protested the Austrian annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina by taking advantage of the upheaval in the Ottoman empire; but Germany unconditionally backed Austria against Russia. Thus, the

Serbian and Russian were forced to back down, however, the crisis restarted serious competition between Austria and Russia and prompted the Balkan states to form their own alliances.

In 1912, Serbia and Bulgaria, then Bulgaria and Greece, and finally Bulgaria and Montenegro, negotiated to make agreements, ostensibly to keep Austria in check, but with secret treaties to attack militarily the Ottoman empire. The Ottomans were defeated by the combined Balkan armies at the end of the Balkan war (1912-13), and the belligerent Balkan countries occupied all of Ottomans' remaining European territories except for a small part in the eastern Turkish Thrace. Then, in 1913, the Balkan states went to war with each other over the division of the invaded territories, allowing the Ottomans to regain Edirne city and a small strip of Thrace around it. After a year, the rivalries of European powers paved the way to a new general European war which was called "The First World War of 1914-18".

Here we shall remind and emphasize that the first world war concluded the process of Ottoman dismemberment. As well known, the Ottomans entered the war on the side of Germany and Austria in December 1914. The traditional Russian threat over Ottoman eastern provinces and the Turkish straits, the technical and economic assistance of Germany to strengthen the Turkish army and the ambition of İttihat Terakki (The Committee for Union and Progress-C.U.P.) movement under the guidance of Enver Paşa to restore Ottoman control over lost-occupied territories prompted the Ottoman state to join the central powers of Europe. In response, The French, the Italians, the Russians, and the British states came together to be allied and declared war against central powers including the Ottomans at the same year. The partition of the Ottoman provinces was agreed by those powers and to solve "Eastern Question" the Sykes-Picot agreement was held in 1916. According to this treaty, France was to obtain an authority of influence in Lebanon, northern Syria, northern Iraq and southwestern Turkey, and Britain would acquire western Arabian territories of Persian Gulf, Transjordan and the rest of Iraq. Palestine would be subject to an international regime. On the other hand, to satisfy the other powers' ambition related with the Ottomans; Russia was to obtain Istanbul and some large cities of eastern Turkey like Kars and Italy was promised southwestern part of Anatolia including the city of Antalya and Mediterranean coast around it. To confirm the ambition of being paramount power in the Near East, Britain also entered other, often contradictory, agreements. In return for Arab support against their Ottoman overlords, the British promised Şerif Hüseyin of Mecca that Britain would recognize and independent Arab state, with reservations for Lebanon and British and French interests. In 1917, the Balfour declaration promised that Britain would also support the formation of a Jewish National Home in Palestine. [4]

In 1918, at the end of first world war, Germany, Austria and the Ottoman empire had been defeated by the European allies. The allied powers quickly started to take actions to destroy Ottoman empire in terms of dismemberment and partition. By being disloyal and injustice to the agreement of Mondros dated 30 October 1918, Britain conquered Palestine, Syria, Iraq and southeastern provinces of Turkey and the allies invaded eastern Turkish Thrace and Istanbul to control the straits. Henceforth, Britain

and France agreed to divide the Middle East into a number of new states, including Lebanon and Syria in the French sphere of influence, and Palestine, Jordan, and Iraq in the British sphere. Italy was conceded southwestern Anatolia. But the most unfortunate act of allied powers regarded with the Ottoman state had been allowing Greece to occupy all Turkish provinces in Thrace, İzmir and the Aegean islands. The claim of this unfaithful prejudged antagonism of the imperial allied powers against the Turks was to provide security for the minorities and the non-Muslim communities living in Turkey, but as it was not justified it made an effect of great grievance in the Turkish peoples conscience. In accordance with that imperialist and provocative decision, Greece forces backed by the British navy invaded İzmir at first, and by continuing to attack towards east to conquer all western parts of Turkey based on "Hellenistic ambition" started to kill, massacre and persecute the Turkish originated Muslim citizens with great horror and Barbarism. [5] In the eastern Anatolia, Armenia was to be an independent state and Kurdistan an autonomous province under the control of imperial powers. İstanbul and the Turkish straits were put under joint allied invasion. Thus, between 1912 and 1920, the Ottoman empire, totally dismembered, lost all of its territories in Balkans, in the Arabic peninsula, and even in its Turkish homeland for centuries. New states were established in Lebanon, Syria, Palestine, Transjordan, and Iraq. Egypt became, under a British protectorate, fully independent of Ottoman suzerainty. As the professor of history, Ira M. Lapidus emphasized in his book related with the partition of the Ottoman state: "the political process; begun more than two centuries before, of reducing and dismembering the Ottoman empire, had reached its term in the formation of a new system of national states" [6].

Here we should underline that the allied process of "expansionist bookings-in-advance" [7] had been culminated in the 1920 Treaty of Sevres. This treaty of the European imperialism confirmed the Turkish impression of ingrained, vindictive Western hostility, fueling resistance in the war of independence of Turks (1919-1922), and leaving a smouldering resentment and suspicion of the West, despite Atatürk's hopes. Unlike the Allies expected and despite being defeated, the Turkish Army and notably Atatürk, emerged from the conflict with professional pride and reputation intact.

The agreement of Mondros which was signed by the Ottoman Sultan on 30 October 1918 had showed unconditional surrender of Ottomans but the Ottomans had thought that they were signing on the basis of American President Wilson's "Fourteen Points" including that of national self-determination. In contrast with these principles, with no regard for any Turkish claims, the whole Ottoman empire had already been partitioned between the imperial powers, as had most of the Anatolian heartland of the Turco-Ottomans. The formulation of a comprehensive postwar settlement for the Ottoman empire was so complex that the terms of a settlement were only finalized in the 1920 Treaty of Sevres. As the Allies and Greek invasion between 1918 and 1919 proved the aggressive-imperialist act, by stripping of its empire it was intended that an Ottoman state and government remain but that it would be severely circumscribed. The Turkish Straits were put under jurisdiction of an international commission [8], Thrace was given to Greece, in addition to sharing Turkish home and heartland-Anatolia with France and

Italy. To complete the dismemberment of Turkey, the Sevres Treaty also recognized an independent Armenian state and a semi-autonomous Kurdish province in eastern and southeastern Anatolia.

THE FOUNDATION OF MODERN TURKEY

The Emergence of Mustafa Kemal as a national leader of Turks:

Before the ink was dry on the paper of Sevres Treaty, the terms of the settlement had been overtaken by amazing events. Invasion of Allies and particularly Greece had a profound effect on the Turkish citizens of Anatolia, many of whom had already been suffered from wars over last decades and dispossession from former areas of the Ottoman empire. In disgust at the Istanbul Government's craven submission to Allied will, societies for "the defense of rights of Turks and Turkish homeland-provinces" sprang up to contest the occupation and division of Turkish territories, emphatically by the hated-barbaric Greeks. Mustafa Kemal had been well known as a famous national hero of the Dardanelles campaign (1915) against the same imperialist powers by the Turkish nation and the movement had its concentration, inspiration and leadership in the Mustafa Kemal's personality.

Before discussing the foundation and modernization of Turkey we shall begin with Mustafa Kemal's words related with the Treaty of Sevres-1920 on 1 March 1921:

"... the nation (Turkish) realizes that the Sevres Treaty- which was acquiesced to by the İstanbul government on the basis of a decision taken by means of a standing vote in the Imperial Council convened in the Sultan's presence in İstanbul- is in fact a sentence of death aimed at the nation's (Turkish) destruction and is therefore incapable of being applied to Turkey... The greatest and most profound disaster that the past year could have burdened us with was the Treaty of Sevres.

Despite all the efforts of the enemy during the last year, today the terms of the Sevres treaty are void in law and fact.

Even if the London conference – concerning the results of which I remain hopeful – ends up leaving in suspense the peace that the entire civilized world is entitled to, it has nevertheless been clearly understood that the terms of the Sevres treaty can never be forcibly imposed upon Turkey..." [9]

And Churchill's judgment on Atatürk should be reminded to give some impression of this unfortunate time of history and the man of Turks:

"Loaded with follies, stained with crimes, rotted with misgovernment, shattered by battle, worn down by long disastrous wars, his empire falling to pieces around him, the Turk was still alive. In his breast was beating the heart of a race that had challenged the world, and for centuries had contended victoriously against all comers. In his hands was once again the equipment of a modern army, and his head a captain, who with all that is learned of him, ranks among the four or five figures of the cataclysm. In the tapestried and gilded chambers of Paris were assembled the law-givers of the world. In Constantinople, under the guns of the Allied fleets, there functioned a puppet Government of Turkey. But among the stern hills and valleys of 'the Turkish Homelands' in Anatolia, there dwelt that company of poor men... who would not see it settled so; and at their bivouac fires at this

moment sat, in the rags of a refugee, the August Spirit of Fair Play." [10]

Mustafa Kemal not only led military operations against the invaders but also sought to harness the new, but ardent, nationalism to an organization that could replace Istanbul as the legitimate representative of that new, politically distinct nation, based on the race of thousands of years of history of mankind, "the Turkish People".

As called "Kemalism" the movement started on 19 May 1919, by a short maritime trip of him from İstanbul to Samsun.

In April 1920, four months before the Treaty of Sevres was even signed, Mustafa Kemal was elected as the president of the new Turkish Grand National Assembly (Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi) in Ankara. Thus the Ottoman state which was based on the theocratic tradition of a strong centralized military heredity was transmitted to the Turkish national authority based on the national will-power. After a series of congresses and declarations in Amasya, Erzurum and Sivas, Mustafa Kemal forced the last Ottoman government in İstanbul to adopt "National Pact" (Misak-ı Milli) on 28 January 1920, as an oath to make Turkish people fully independent and living in the secured heartland of Turks within national boundaries freely. The national Pact acknowledged the loss of the Balkans and renounced outright any territorial claims to former Arab provinces, but affirmed the right of full Turkish sovereignty over those remaining soil of the Ottoman empire inhabited by Turks for centuries. It has remained the basis of Turkish foreign policy ever since. [11]

According to the scientists of history, the history of modern Turkey can be divided into two phases. The period from 1918 to 1923 was the era of the war of independence as called "the salvation" and the period from 1923 to 1938 was the era of the reformism and modernization of the Turkish Republic as called "the foundation". [12]

The War of Independence - The Salvation (1918-1923):

The influence of the heroic nature of the national struggle of Turks for the independence of the new Turkish state cannot be overminded. Before starting the war of independence, the situation in Turkish homeland was described by Mustafa Kemal in his same speech delivered on 1 March 1921:

"Let me remind you, gentlemen, that even as our determination and faith were being sorely tried by the distressing events that were being instigated at home such as these, our enemies never for a moment relented in their provoking and encouraging external pressure and savagery. In the west, the Greeks; in the south, the French-and the Armenians who had been armed and set upon us by French- and in the east, the Armenians of Ermenistan were all perpetrating cruelty and massacre upon the Muslim folk of the parts of our country they had seized and in the areas of the borders and fronts they occupied. At a time when many of our armed forces were preoccupied with internal insurrections and the formation of our regular army was as yet incomplete, the Greeks attacked our western front, which was then being defended by local militia. While the material consequences of these conflicts are distressing, they nevertheless should be considered beneficial in as much as they convinced the nation that there was a genuine need for a more resolute defense. In the wake of the armistice the enemy disarmed our

forces, reduced their numbers, and dispersed them yet, despite this, in a very short time we succeeded in restoring and renewing these troops, rearming and resupplying them in the process. Today we have forces at our command on every front. These men are fighting for victory and are fully aware of what the defense of the homeland means." [13]

After achievement of effective combatting reorganization of Turkish armed forces, the Turks had prepared themselves to fight militarily firstly on the eastern front in order to secure the eastern occupied provinces by Armenians and then on the southeastern and western fronts against Allied imperial powers. On the eastern front, the Turkish army had successfully completed the eastern operation, and had reliberated Kars, Ardahan and Artvin, and the first political victory of Kemalism had been the agreement with Armenia on 3 December 1920.

Unlike the other campaigns in history, the southeastern invaded provinces of Turkey had been defended by the Turkish civilian citizens with great self-sacrifice against French and Armenian military forces and they had displayed a rare degree of heroic in the defense and liberation of their homeland in the same year.

On the western front, having emerged from the first encounter at İnönü in the early part of January 1921, the army basically worked at expanding its internal organization, in a manner whose aims were not apparent to enemy eyes, and was on the point of completing its readiness with great determination for decisive victories against Allied powers. At the same time, the Greeks were treating the London conference (23 February-12 March 1921) as a vehicle whereby they might gain some time and also deceive the Turks and were procrastinating until the season for military action returned. It did so around the middle March, by which time the Greek army had completed its preparations and therefore no longer had any reason to go on stalling. With a great display of conceit and much fanfare, they abandoned the London conference to inconclusiveness.

On March 23rd, the forces of imperialism launched an assault upon the western parts of Turkish country from every quarter so coordinated as to make it seem as if it had been undertaken from within a single, vast colony. After the initial few days of the usual bombast, the forces became engaged in an intractable struggle. The result, was the great event that history records as the Second Battle of İnönü on 1 April 1921. The second encounter at İnönü was what displayed to the whole world the justice and sanctity of the national cause of Turks and similarly taught the world how fraudulent the Greek demands really were. And after the second battle, the Greeks demonstrated to the whole world their bloodthirsty brutality by setting the Turkish country to the torch and by murdering disarmed Turkish soldiers and those who were incapable even of bearing arms. Investigations had clearly demonstrated and proven that the conflagrations of Bilecik, Bozüyük, Söğüt, and Yenişehir as well as countless incidents of rape and massacre were all perpetrated by specially assigned teams and at the orders of Greek commanders. After the second battle at İnönü, however, the Greeks had come to the realization that the issue was not so straightforward as they had supposed. [14]

The victory of Turks at the İnönü battle convinced Russia in terms of success of Turkish independence war against imperialism and a friendship pact was concluded in

Moscow on 16 March 1921. By means of this agreement, the natural cooperation between two states that were both the targets of the voracious depredations of imperialism had been given a formal and legal status. It had been decided that agreements incorporating economic and commercial cooperation and another providing for consular representation were to be concluded in the near future. This Turco-Russian treaty named "The Treaty of Moscow" was the first of a number of gratifying compacts with other countries that were Russia's allies. On October 13th in the same year, another treaty named "Kars" had been concluded in Kars, with Azerbaijan, Georgia, Armenia, and the Soviet Republics which was based on the framework of principles set out in the Moscow treaty. This treaty was just one of the signs that Turkish de jure situation in the east was just as to render implementation of the Sevres treaty impossible and the Turkish National Pact was acknowledged by Russia and other Soviet Republics related with occupied eastern provinces of Turkey. [15] The so-called "Armenian question", which was a problem for which the solution being sought was more in keeping with the economic concerns of world capitalism than it was the true interests of the Armenian nation, was finally resolved to the mutual satisfaction of all by means of the Kars treaty. The bonds of goodwill between two industrious peoples who had lived side by side for so many centuries had at last been restored. [16]

After the defeat at the İnönü battle, the Greeks decided to initiate a number of more serious measures that took the form of a general mobilization. While proceeding with these preparations, they also mounted political and diplomatic propaganda campaign in the hope of deceiving the Turks and lulling the Turks into a sense of false security. The Greek king came to Anatolia and assumed the commandship of his generals who had ordered the commission of acts of arson and rape. Greek mobilization preliminaries were completed around the beginning of July 1921 and their new assault was launched. As the initial part of their offensive, the Greeks occupied Afyon, Kütahya, and Eskişehir, mendaciously avowing to the whole world that the Turkish army had been annihilated. Although those with common sense and judgment discounted such propaganda efforts, it appeared that the Greeks themselves were taken in by it for they were encouraged by such conceits to prosecute the campaign until bloodily rebuffed at Sakarya, where, utterly routed, the true circumstances of their defeat became known to the whole world. About this Turkish victory, named "The Battle of Sakarya" which was won by the Turks decisively based on Mustafa Kemal's genius military leadership and outstanding defense strategy against the imperial supported powers on 13 September 1921, Mustafa Kemal said:

"In the wake of this monumental defeat, The Greek army once again embarked upon a campaign of brutal savagery at the orders of its king and princes. Our devastated villages and our ravaged women and children are all there for all the world to see. The Greek princes and generals seem to take particular delight in rape. Among us, as among the rest of the world, such defilement is regarded with horror." [17]

The great defeat of Greece at the Battle of Sakarya initiated the talks with the other imperial European power, namely, France and the discussions wound up with a Turco-French agreement reached in Ankara on 20 October 1921. This agreement, was of paramount and extraordinary importance for France was one of the most important of the

Allied states that were party to and directly responsible for the writing of the Sevres treaty. By acknowledging the Ankara agreement, France had de facto and de jure recognized that Sevres was a dead letter. By means of this agreement not only had the Turks secured a number of rights that were of great moral importance to them but the Turks had also recovered a precious part of their homeland after a separation of more than three years. A number of hostile powers, unable to abide the thought that this region might be returned to its true owners, sought to stir up disturbances in order to prevent it. Their efforts proved to be in vain. The process of handing over the southeastern occupied Turkish territory was conducted and completed in complete order. In the wake of Ankara agreement, formal diplomatic relations were established between the government of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey and the Republic of France and a representative of the Turkish government was dispatched to Paris.

During the period of the independence war of Turks nothing in their foreign policy, incorporates any designs upon the rights of any other state like the Turkish peaceful foreign policy which was based on Atatürk's thoughts and principles of today. They defended nothing but their rights, their lives, their country, and their honor against imperialism. By aiming at fully freedom and independence in their Turkish heartland the Turks had prepared themselves for the last blow to attain this goal and Turkish armed forces confronting the Greeks on the western front mounted their great assault on August 26th 1922. After a series of swift victories and the battle of Dumlupınar on 30 August 1922, all of western Anatolia had quickly been liberated from the Greeks. Under the impact of the same blow, the imperial powers had been forced to evacuate and surrender İstanbul; the Turkish straits and eastern Thrace to the hands of Turks as they claimed in the National Pact of their own in 1920. In the wake of this mighty victory, the Turks forced the Allied powers to start negotiations for the immortal future of Turkish nation and achieved to conclude the treaty of Lausanne on 24 July 1923.[18] Thus, from imperial collapse, partition and occupation of imperial powers in the period of 1918 to 1920 it emerged three years later as the internationally recognized, fully independent and sovereign nation-state of the Republic of Turkey.

The Foundation and Modernization of Turkey – The Foundation (1923-1938):

Despite the prejudged aggressiveness of western powers, the partition and invasion of homeland of Turks by the imperialistic ambitions of European Allies, Atatürk saw the future of national development in the adoption of contemporary principles of the West and was determined to align Turkey with Europe. By being very much proud of the victory of the independence war, Turkey began its existence stripped of an empire, but conscious of imperial greatness and its strong national identity namely "Turk" which was based on Atatürk's legacy. Bearing in mind, when Atatürk started his reforms, the old traditions and thoughts of the Ottoman period were still in power particularly in the conservative rural areas of Turkey, the country and the nation were very poor in terms of economy and resources and the homeland was devastated and destroyed and according to some statistics two and one-half million Turks had been died, leaving a population of about 13.3 million in Thrace and Anatolia.[19]

Atatürk founded the Republic on the basis of a single, overriding national mission given to the Turkish people: the elevation of Turkey to the level of contemporary civilization. The basic goals of the nation were national security based on territorial integrity and full sovereignty and the modernization of Turkish society.

The period from 1923 to 1938 was the era of Atatürk's presidential leadership, religious reform, and the first stages of industrialization. In fact the Mustafa Kemal's principles' period began in 1921 with the Law of Fundamental Organization which declared the sovereignty of the Turkish people.

In 1923 Mustafa Kemal was named president of the Republic. He was head of government, and head of the Republican People's Party of 1924. His party was the main instrument of the regime in the countryside, and its offices disseminated information about agricultural improvements, organized educational programs, and taught the secular and national ideology to the country people. At the first period of reformist actions, the regime of Mustafa Kemal thus continued the Ottoman system in which a highly educated, urban, bureaucratic, and military elite dominated the rest of the country. The religious authority (Ulema) and local notables were excluded from political power but landlords (Aşiret Reisleri) were allowed to retain and consolidate their economic position. At first, it seemed that it was a regime in the name of the Turkish people, but without close connections with them but later by using peoples' educative houses widely in all over the rural parts of the country the regime provided the goals of reforms to be understood by the Turkish people effectively.

The primary goals of Atatürk's Turkey were economic development and cultural modernization. In the course of the nineteenth century, European competition forced Muslim elites out of commerce and into reliance on the state as the main vehicle of economic activity. Between 1908 and 1918, however, foreign capital was withdrawn, and the way was opened for the growth of a new Turkish commercial elite. However, in the 1920s foreigners still controlled Turkish banks and the import-export trade based on the agreement of capitulations with the European imperial powers.

By abolishing the capitulations with Lausanne agreement in 1923, the Mustafa Kemal's regime resumed state sponsorship of economic development. It promoted agricultural production by reducing taxes and by investing in roads and railways. Exports of cotton, tobacco, and dried fruit rose. The Turkish Republic also took the lead in pioneering further industrial development. With Soviet loans and expertise, textile factories were built in the 1920s. With the collapse of the export market in 1929, Turkey turned to more energetic state control of the economy and planned economic development. In the 1930s the state nationalized the railroads, utilities, ports, and mines. The first five-year plan of Atatürk's government (1929-1933) promoted consumer substitution industries. The Sümer Bank was founded to finance textile, paper, glass, and sugar enterprises. In the 1920s and 1930s, the foundations were set for the emergence of a modern industrial economy.

We should emphasize that the most important policy of the Atatürk's regime was the cultural revolution. Mustafa Kemal sought to absorb the masses of the people into the ideological and cultural framework of the Republican regime, broke the authority of

ignorant dominance using the Islamic religion as a power and as a tool for cheating the ordinary people, and won them to a contemporary, secular and modern style of life based on the science and wisdom.

The new regime abolished the degenerated institutions of religious organizations. The Ottoman Sultanate was abolished on 1 November 1922 and the Caliphate on 3 March 1924. All religious endowments and schools were put under the control of a new ministry of state's religious affairs. On November 30th 1925 the Sufi orders were declared illegal and were disbanded. On November 25th 1925 the wearing of a fez forbidden. On 10 April 1928, the Turkish National Assembly changed some articles of the 1924 constitution and made the Republic of Turkey to be governed by secular principles.

On 1 November 1928 a new Latin script was introduced to replace the Arabic script and Persian content and modern schools were opened with the principles of national and contemporary identity.

In 1934 all Turks were required to take surnames. In the course of this period, a new family law based upon Swiss legal codes was adopted and the ordinary symbols of Turkish attachment to the traditional culture were replaced by new legal, linguistic, and other signs of modern identity. The other change in the way of modernization was the status and legal rights of Turkish women. Family laws of 1924 abolished polygamy, made the sexes substantially equal in rights to divorce, and required that divorce henceforth be subject to court rulings on specified conditions rather than a male prerogative. The constitution guaranteed the right of women to equality in education and employment, and in 1934 women were accorded the right to vote in national elections. In 1935 women deputies were elected to the Turkish parliament. The changes in attitude and legal principle had been the basis of an ever-expanding participation of women in Turkish public life.

Thus the reformism implied the dynamic transformation of the Turkish state and society, in line with Atatürk's ideological commitment to the contemporary world. The challenge of Atatürk was to balance the demands of the religious, ethnic, and cultural aspects of society, with the ideological modernization policy to Western civilization, while at the same time defending Turkish homeland against external threats. Therefore, "Atatürk took up a non-existent, hypothetical entity, the Turkish nation, and breathed life into it... Whenever a rationale was invoked for his moves, the reason given was that of the requirements of contemporary civilization." [20]

Reforms were essentially imposed from above to the old – fashioned people for centuries in culture, science, technique and mind, and modern Turkey developed under the tutelage of Atatürk and a small, determined elite incredibly.

Atatürk's ideological guidance of modernization imposed from the implementation of the principles embodied in the "Six Arrows" of his thought, adopted by the Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi (The Republican Peoples Party) in 1931 and endorsed within the Constitution in 1937. [21] These principles were: nationalism, republicanism, populism, statism, reformism and secularism. The concept of the principles of six arrows directed Turkish Republic's domestic and foreign policy including the modernization

requirements for decades.

Nationalism described the identical explanation of "Turk" and "Turkish People", rejecting both irrendentist Ottoman inclinations and expansionist ambitions of "Pan-Turkism".

Republicanism prevented the re-establishment goals of the Sultanate and Caliphate and attracted contemporary democratic regimes and republics in order to be progressed in modern global life.

Populism embraced the equality of all citizens within democratic regime provided by the Turkish Republic.

Statism concentrated the sources of the country for economic development in governmental guidance as a reaction against the "capitulations" and foreign imperialist economic domination in the Ottoman era.

Reformism implied the dynamic transformation of the Turkish society and republican organizations, in line with Atatürk's modernization ideology and commitment to the civilized and contemporary world.

Secularism as being the most important principle, aimed at the separation of state and religion, denied the leading role of Islamic authority and provided equality to the Turkish citizens and communities whatever religious and belief they have in democratic life.

Thus, this great hero and genius man of Turks of twentieth century died in 1938 but created a new modern Turkish state based on the peaceful principles of humanism of contemporary-democratic globe which had been an admirable model of path to all Middle Eastern, Third World and Islamic Countries want to be modernized and fully sovereign.

References

- [1] Armaoğlu F.,1991, 20. Yüzyıl Siyasi Tarihi, c.1: 1914-1980 (*The Political History of Twentieth Century*), Ankara, Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, p.31.
- [2] Armaoğlu F., 20. Yüzyıl Siyasi Tarihi (*The Political History of Twentieth Century*), p.53.
- [3] See Harris D. 1936, *A Diplomatic History of the Balkan Crisis of 1875-1878: The First Year*, London.
- [4] Helmreich P. C., 1974, *From Paris to Sevres: The Partition of the Ottoman Empire at the Peace Conference of 1919-1920*, Ohio, Columbus, Ohio State University Press, p. 1-7.
- [5] 1992, *Türk İstiklal Harbi, Mondros Mütarekesi ve Tatbikatı (Turkish Independence War, The Application of the Agreement of Mondros)*, Ankara, Genelkurmay Basımevi, p. 60, 72, 90, 93, 105, 110, 162, 172, 179, 185, 188, 234, 238-239, 247-251.
- [6] Lapidus Ira M., 1989, *A History of Islamic Societies*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, p. 597.
- [7] Monroe E., 1981, *Britain's Moment in the Middle East, 1914-1971*, London, p. 26.
- [8] See Vali F.A., 1972, *The Turkish Straits and NATO*, London, Stanford Hoover Institution Studies.
- [9] The Opinions, Remarks, Speeches and Statements of Ghazi Mustafa Kemal Atatürk (1920-1938), 1995, The Foundation for Establishing and Promoting Centers for Historical Research and Documantation, İstanbul, p.18-19.
- [10] Kinross L.,1993, *Atatürk: The Rebirth of a Nation*, London,Weidenfeld and Nicholson, p.184.
- [11] Giritli İ., Eylül (September) 2000, *Kurtuluş ve Kuruluş, Demokratik ve Laik Cumhuriyetin Oluşum ve Gelişim Süreci (The Salvation and The Foundation, The Establishment and Development of The Democratic and Secular Turkish Republic)*, İstanbul, Beta Basım Yayım Dağıtım A.Ş., p.29.
- [12] See Giritli İ., Kurtuluş ve Kuruluş.
- [13] The Opinions, Remarks, Speeches and Statements of Ghazi Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, p.15.
- [14] The Opinions, Remarks, Speeches and Statements of Ghazi Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, p.49.
- [15] Giritli İ., Kurtuluş ve Kuruluş, p.64-65.
- [16] The Opinions, Remarks, Speeches and Statements of Ghazi Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, p.40.

Necati Ulunay Ucuzsatar

- [17] The Opinions, Remarks, Speeches and Statements of Ghazi Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, p.50.
- [18] See for detail for understanding of ambitions of imperial powers before acknowledgement of the Lausanne Treaty: Dr. Öke M.K., 1983, *İngiliz Belegelerinde Lozan Barış Konferansı (British Documents on The Lausanne Conference,1922-1923), Volume 1, 3 September-20 November 1922*, İstanbul, Boğaziçi University Publications.
- [19] Zurcher E.J., 1993, *Turkey, A Modern History*, London and NewYork, I.B. Taurus, p.170-172.
- [20] Mardin Ş., 1981, *Ataturk: Founder of a Modern State*, London,C.Hurst, p. 208-209.
- [21] Shaw S.J. and Shaw E. K., 1977, *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey, 2 vols.*, Gateshead, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, p.375-395.