

Unsung Stories of Sacrifice: Early Years of the Turkish Republic (1920-1926)

Mevlüt CEYLAN*

Abstract

There are two versions of history in Turkey today: the official and the unofficial. Available material in English on Turkish history and politics reflect mostly Orientalist and official points of views. The official version appears not only to contradict much of the existing evidence but also to reinforce misinterpretations of the Republican era. Here is an attempt, albeit a modest one, to present the unofficial version of history through the profiles of people who took part in the War of Independence between 1919 and 1923. Even though they played a dynamic role during the turbulent period of Turkish history - giving voice to the beliefs and sentiments of the static majority - they were condemned to death. Their strength of character and conviction imbued with their influence over the masses was an explosive cocktail which struck terror in the hearts of the new ruling elite. The rise of secular Turkey from the funeral pyre of the Ottomans and the resulting transformation of Turkish society occurred against a background of chaos and despair. The value system and a way of life embodying a certain set of beliefs and ethics which the people had chosen for themselves were discarded by the new guardians of the State. And anyone who disagreed with the prescription for this new life was a disposable item.

Keywords: History, Ottomans, Orientalist, Revolutionary, Mudros.

* Assist. Prof. Dr., Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Department of Sociology, Canakkale, Turkey.
Elmek: mevlutceylan@yahoo.co.uk
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6768-414X>

Geliř Tarihi / Received Date: 13.12.2019
Kabul Tarihi / Accepted Date: 21.02.2020

DOI: 10.30767/diledeara.688804

Anlatılmamış Fedakarlık Hikâyeleri: Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin İlk Yılları (1920-1926)

Öz

Bugün Türkiye'de tarihin iki farklı yorumu var: resmi ve gayri resmi. Türk tarihi ve siyaseti hakkında İngilizce olarak mevcut materyaller çoğunlukla Oryantalist ve resmi bakış açılarını yansıtmaktadır. Resmi tarih yorumu sadece mevcut kanıtların çoğuyla çelişmekle kalmayıp, aynı zamanda Cumhuriyet döneminin yanlış yorumlanmasını güçlendiriyor gibi görünmektedir. Bu çalışma, 1919-1923 yılları arasında Kurtuluş Savaşı'na katılan insanların profilleri aracılığıyla tarihin gayri resmi versiyonunu sunma girişimidir. Söz konusu şahsiyetler Türk tarihinin çalkantılı döneminde dinamik bir rol oynamalarına rağmen - statik çoğunluğun inançlarına ve duygularına ses olduklarından - ölüme mahkum edilmişlerdi. Kitleler üzerindeki etkileriyle karakter ve inanç güçleri, yeni yönetici seçkinlerin kalbine dehşet veren patlayıcı bir kokteyldir. Laik Türkiye'nin Osmanlıların küllerinden doğması - Türk toplumunun dönüşümü bir kaos ve umutsuzluğun arka planında meydana gelmiştir. İnsanların kendileri için seçtiği belirli inanç ve ahlak dizilerini somutlaştıran değer sistemi ve yaşam biçimi, Devletin yeni koruyucuları tarafından toplumun hayatından atılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Devrimci, Mondros, Oryantalist, Osmanlılar, Tarih.

Introduction

The perception of the train of events in the 1920s, such as war and peace, the nation's destiny, polity and statecraft, varied depending on whether one belonged to the people or to the ruling elite. There was no unitary view of things. It is, therefore, a misconception, from which even historians and researches have been unable to save themselves, to believe that the people and their leaders were united by the same indivisible ethos, despite major differences in their perception of the world around them. Therefore, what needs to be borne in mind is that new Turkey was not born without a struggle.

The main aim of this exploratory work is to give a glimpse of the recent history of the Turkish Republic, putting into perspective the lives of the leaders who contributed to the culture and independence of Turkey and to the Islamic movements in Muslim countries. The leaders chosen for study here continue to shape and influence Islamic thinking in Turkey, 70 years after the fall of the Ottoman and rise of modern Turkey (Mardin, 1991).

The history of the Ottoman Empire is like a tale from the Arabian fantasy, *A Thousand and One Nights*. A superpower in its heyday, Ottoman Turkey was built by a handful of nomadic Turkoman tribes who, in the span of only two hundred years, became masters of a sprawling empire, from the Balkans, the gateway of Europe, to North Africa and the Middle East, and which lasted longer than the Roman Empire (Lewis, 2009).

An article on Revolutionary Courts or Independent Tribunals, set up during the War of Independence, and a translation of the pamphlet, *Dear Oppressed People of Anatolia*, that was distributed in 1920 by Iskilipli Muhammad Atif Effendi, Chairman of the very powerful Islamic Society, included here, will provide the backdrop to the apocalyptic changes overtaking Turkey - the seat of the last Islamic Khilafat.

Absolute Powers of Revolutionary Courts

To understand the role of Independent Tribunals in Turkey, whose legacy lingers on 70 years after their establishment, one has to trace their origin to the early days of the Turkish Republic. Set up originally to deal with the law and order situation following the breakup of the Ottoman Empire, the Tribunals, in fact, assumed the primary function of meeting challenges to the newly-born secular State under Mustafa Kemal (Aybars, 1995).

The armistice signed on 30 October 1918 at the port of Mudros on the Greek island of Lemnos, aboard the British battleship *Agamemnon*, spelt the death of the Ottoman Empire. The fateful day-long talks which began at 9.30 in the morning of Sunday ended with the abject surrender of the Ottomans. The original proposal of the Allies, with its 24 clauses, accepted in its entirety meant the dismembering of the army, handing over control of the arms and transport to the Allies and placing Turkish territory at the disposal of the victors (Lewis, 2009).

Thus the Turkish people were not only obliged to support the invaders but were also burdened with the ultimate humiliation of agreeing to the setting up of independent Armenia in Eastern Anatolia. The early 1920s witnessed utter devastation in the country. To the war-weary Turks, hunger was a more potent threat than the enemies themselves. They feared for their lives and their live-stock as the authorities were unable to restore law and order, because of which vast numbers of people were constantly on the move. More than two million people were missing in action, were sick, deserters or prisoners of war, and half a million were disabled.

The deserters were a menace to society and the main obstacle to the institution of a regular army. Against the regular armies of invaders, Turkey's sole guerrilla forces proved ineffective. The run-away soldiers were swelling the ranks of highwaymen mostly in the countryside. Such a situation hindered the development of a united front against the enemy. Therefore, solving the problems of deserters became a priority: and forming a regular army, essential to stop further encroachments on the people.

In August 1920 Dr Taufiq Shukru Bey suggested to Mustafa Kemal that Revolutionary Courts be set up to deal with “the problems”(Aybars, 1995). During the early days of the War of Independence, deserters were pursued relentlessly with a policy of confiscation of livestock and burning down or destruction of their homes.

“This policy proved effective”, according to Defense Minister Marshal Fevzi Cakmak Bey. He warned “those who resist the officers of the law will be punished by hanging. Those officers who do not do their jobs properly will also be punished under the law of treason”(Aybars, 1995). Thus implementation of the law became the responsibility of the Departments of Defense, Justice and Finance and the Home Office.

The Revolutionary Courts which were renamed Independent Tribunals were initially formed to deal only with the deserters and help keep together the national forces. However, before long, their jurisdiction expanded enormously to cover such areas as espionage, treason, bribery, riots and robbery. The Tribunals became particularly powerful as half their members were appointed from the members of the Grand National Assembly (GNA), the country’s nominated Parliament.

On 16 September 1920 Salahuddin Bey and his friends put forward the proposal to the Cabinet, explaining the procedures of electing the members of the Tribunals, their function and the exact numbers required. With the endorsement of the proposal, two days later, Mustafa Kemal presented all the documents to the Speaker of the Grand National Assembly (Aybars, 1995).

Tribunals were proposed for 14 regions: Kastamonu, Eskisehir, Konya, Isparta, Ankara, Kayseri, Sivas, and Maras, Ma’murat ul Aziz, Diyarbekir, Bitlis, Refahiye, Erzurum and Van. After a heated debate, Ismet Bey’s suggestion that Tribunals be set up initially in seven regions was accepted. Following the election of the Tribunal members, they met to draw up a working charter on 27 September. A written statement prepared by Rafiq Shaukat Bey stressed the danger facing the country and Islam and called for mobilisation. Deserters were promised amnesty if they surrendered to the authorities (Aybars, 1995).

Ankara Tribunal was the only one that was working without a break between 7 October 1920 and 31 July 1922, when all the courts in the country were abolished. Within four months the Tribunals established law and order and succeeded in mobilising the military.

During the War of Independence, the Tribunals played a constructive role and the authority of the Grand National Assembly was recognised by both the Turkish people and foreign States. Law and order was restored. The foundation of a regular army was laid down. Conscripts were registered and taxes collected which contributed to the outcome of the war. But the second period of the Tribunals - in the Republican era (1923-1927) - was entirely a different story.

Mustafa Kemal's declaration in Parliament, before the abolition of the Ottoman monarchy on 1 November 1922, that "some heads will be cut off", proved more than prophetic: it invested the Tribunals with a new *raison d'être*, turning them into zealous guardians of Kemal's New Turkey (Aybars, 1995).

The rift between Mustafa Kemal, the moving spirit behind the extermination of Ottoman Turkey, and those members who equally passionately were determined to preserve the monarchy and Khilafat - Islamic polity - widened. Kemal and members of the Government were accused of taking part in a series of assassination of political opponents, such as Ali Shukru Bey and Husain Avni Bey. Consequently, Parliament was suspended on 16 April 1923, but not before drafting a Bill that would render supporters of the Ottoman dynasty and Khilafat vulnerable to prosecution.

A letter dated 5 December 1923 from the Agha Khan and Sayyid Amir Ali, Chairman of the London-based Islamic Association and author of *The Spirit of Islam*, to the Turkish Prime Minister, urging the retention of the Khilafat because of its importance to the entire Muslim world, provided Ismet Inonu with a backdrop to stage what in effect became Operation Crackdown (Aybars, 1995). Ismet Inonu, the right hand of Mustafa Kemal, raised the issue in Parliament at a secret session on 8 December. In an atmosphere charged with urgency, the Prime Minister pushed for the setting up of Independent Tribunals in accordance with the law passed on 31 July 1922, emphasising "there is no other way to stop the opponents and the media". The same day, a Bill was passed,

empowering the Cabinet to set up Independent Tribunals. The same day, the Istanbul Tribunal was

set up and its members appointed (Aybars, 1995).

Editors and publishers of Tanin, Iqdam and Tevhi-di Afkar newspapers (Husain Shahid, Valid, Ahmed Jawed and Umar Izzat Din Bey), charged with plotting against the State and Government and conspiring with the enemy, were the first to be tried. At the end of a short trial all the accused were cleared of the charges, but the trial set the stage for all dissidents: it was to signal a warning not merely to the media that the Government would brook no dissent, no matter how weak or from wherever.

Ali Shukru Bey: “Ready to Die”

Nurtured in the twilight of the Ottoman Empire, Ali Shukru Bey was the generation of Turks fated to endure the shattering experience of defeat in the First World War (1914-1918), leading to the occupation of Turkey, abolition of the Sultanate and Caliphate and birth of an uncompromising secular, West-oriented Turkish Nationalist State.

The dark clouds of political unrest and uncertainty, which preceded these cataclysmic events and hung over the early years of the Republic of Turkey (1923-1930) - and still do - also exacted a terrible price from those who resisted the imposition of a violently new “world order”.

Muslim peoples, be they Turks, Arabs or whatever, had in the past suffered the fury of invading forces of Mongols and Crusaders. But in the aftermath of the First World War, the Anatolian Turks suffered additionally at the hands of their popularly acclaimed leaders.

Ali Shukru Bey was one such individual among many who felt it was both his right and duty to speak up for what he considered more important than his own life. He was born in 1884 in Sarli, a town near the city of Trebizond. He received his early education from his father Hafiz Ahmed and graduated from the Naval College in 1904. He later became Secretary of the Naval Society which was founded in 1909 to help strengthen the Turkish Navy (Mısırođlu,

2012).

As a member of the Naval Society he visited Liverpool to buy British-built cargo ships. During his extended stay there, Italy attacked Tripoli, sparking off a campaign to secure public support against the Ottomans from other European States (Mısıroğlu, 2012). Ali Shukru's first foray into politics and public affairs occurred there in defense of Muslim interests: he wrote many articles in *The Liverpool Times* refuting Italy's unfounded claims.

Ali Shukru Bey entered national politics as a member of the last Ottoman Parliament (12 January 1920-16 March 1920) representing Trebizond (Mısıroğlu, 2012). Istanbul, the imperial capital which had not fallen to foreign forces since it became the throbbing heart of the Ottomans after the conquest of Constantinople by Mehmed Fateh, was under foreign occupation.

The MP for Trebizond fought hard, but in vain, against moving the Parliament from Istanbul. Osman Ergin's report of the fateful debate in the last Ottoman Parliament reveals the intensity of Ali Shukru's feelings. "In the discussion hall each member was explaining the volatile situation we were in. Ali Shukru Bey, MP for Trebizond, came up to the platform, upset and agitated, to say: 'We must risk the death of our last man, but we cannot afford that.' Someone added meekly: 'The British Navy is on our doorstep.' Another said: 'The country will turn into chaos.' But Shukru had the last word. 'Gentlemen, what the hell are you all doing here, then? If you are so afraid, go back to your mothers' bosoms'" (Mısıroğlu, 2012).

When the newly-formed Grand National Assembly met in Ankara, the new capital, on 23 April 1920, the MP for Trebizond was there taking part in its deliberations with undiminished gusto. Two days later, with a group of friends, he raised the question of the position of ministerial jobs. The Leader of the Parliament had selected hurriedly the ministers, but Ali Shukru Bey argued that ministers should be chosen by the Prime Minister, not by Parliament. It was necessary for a productive working atmosphere; otherwise, he felt the country would suffer the consequences.

According to Ali Shukru, "For satisfactory results the Prime Minister has

to choose his colleagues. This is the only way we can make ministers responsible for their actions. If we choose ministers who would not work in harmony with the Prime Minister, how can we question them?"

Despite his well-argued case, Parliament rejected it. That Shukru was gifted with a rare political insight became apparent when the Government later came around to his way of thinking: ministers are now appointed by the Prime Minister.

Amir Bey, a member of the Republic's first Parliament, says Shukru was a very good speaker. He held to his principles. "As a conservative he had influence on the Imams and conservative people, but was in control of his ego. Banning the consumption of alcohol was his idea which Parliament endorsed. He described people who talked in favour of the Government as puppets and used to say they were afraid of not getting elected to Parliament for the second term. "He was a master of the critics. He became one of the natural leading figures of the opposition." Shukru was a skillful parliamentarian, adept at questioning ministers who dreaded him (Damar, 1961).

Mahir Iz Bey who was one of the Parliamentary Secretaries wrote in his memoirs that during the secret session in which the abolition of khilafah was discussed Ali Shukru Bey became the spokesman of the opposition. Discussion went on late into the night. Everybody was tired, but Ali Shukru Bey stood listening to the speakers. More than 15 times he went up to the podium to speak. Then he went towards the podium again, asking for permission to speak. At that point, Rauf Bey who was held in respect by everybody stopped him saying: "Shukru, that's enough! That's enough! Shukru, sit down!"

Shukru Bey suddenly turned around and said: "Rauf, I'm ready to die for the cause! What are you talking about?"

"After listening to his speech, I told Rauf Bey, the Director of Security, 'Ali Shukru Bey has signed his own death warrant.'" And in his memoirs, Mahir Bey writes: "I was proved right." (İz, 2013).

Ali Shukru Bey had one abiding aim that the Shari'ah must be the law of the land. He struggled for the cause until he became a martyr in March 1923.

Shaikh Said's Formidable Challenge

Shaikh Said Pirani was hanged on 29 June 1925 in Diyarbakir. His uprising was the most serious challenge to the infant Turkish Republic. Among the Shaikhs belonging to the Naqshbandi order, he was the most powerful in the Kurdish area of Turkey. Since the Shaikhs were traditionally held in great esteem by the people, Shaikh Said's uprising posed a severe threat. The rebellion being confined mainly to the Kurdish region, and its prime movers being of Kurdish origin, the Shaikh is regarded as a principal Kurdish nationalist leader (Türkmen, 2012).

In fact, the nature of Shaikh Said's rebellion differed from other conflicts in the Kurdish area essentially because of his Islamic consciousness. It was not only State propaganda that did everything to distort his message. Many people, including his followers, misinterpreted his mission as well (Ceylan, 1989; Fazıl, 1992)

The policies of the republican regime, proclaimed as reforms, were designed to lead Turkish society towards westernisation. Because the ordinary people realised they were taking them away from Islam, if not putting them into conflict with some of the teachings of Islam, they held the reforms in great contempt and resisted them (Türkmen, 2012).

The abolition of the caliphate on 23 March 1924 widened the gap between the State and its citizens. Intimidation, assassinations and the use of terror tactics against dissent drove the people to revolt. However, resistance and revolts only ended in mass execution of those involved.

That Shaikh Said was no nationalist seeking a separate homeland for the Kurds is absolutely clear from the text of his letter and fatwa which he sent to various tribal chieftains.

The Letter: "Since the day the Republic came into existence, President Mustafa Kemal and his selected friends have been trying to ruin Islam and distort its values. This is an illegitimate regime, because it does not act in accordance with the Qur'an. Its rulers deny the Prophet and Khalifah, because they drove out the Khalifah. The lives of such people who have committed these

crimes - and their followers - are, therefore, haram. They must all be punished according to the Shari'ah." (Yücedağ, 2010; Aybars, 1995).

The Fatwa: "To the Chieftains of Hormak tribe.

"In the name of Allah, the Compassionate, the Merciful.

"We have left for Shushar to honour the Prophet and Islam and to remove the oppressor Mustafa Kemal and his hand-picked Government from the face of the earth.

"Jihad is an obligation on all Muslims regardless of their madhhab and tariqa. This is the war for establishing Islamic rule in this land again. This is the call for your Muslim tribe to take part in this great holy war. I believe you will comply with this call.

"O people! Let us save Islam from the hands of these kafirs. This atheist Government will make us atheist like themselves. Jihad against them is an obligation.

"In the name of Allah, come out for Jihad..."

"Kanuni-sani 4, 1341

"Amirul-Mujahidin As-sayyid Muhammad Said Naqshbandi (Mumcu, 1993).

On 13 February, Shaikh Said visited his brother, Shaikh Abdurrahim, who lived in the Shabiyan neighbourhood of Piran, now known as Dijle. His khutbah at the Mosque underlined the reason for his opposition to the regime:

"Madrassahs are closed; the Ministry of Waqf has been abolished. Some atheist writers have started to belittle Islam and its Prophet. I will be the first to fight for the religion of Allah " (Fazıl, 1992).

In a highly charged atmosphere of unrest and resentment, an unfortunate incident sparked off the revolt on 8 February 1925. Shaikh Said was caught unprepared.

Six army deserters took refuge in Piran while the Shaikh was there. The commanders of the unit, Lieutenant Mustafa and Lieutenant Hasan Husnu, sur-

rounded the village demanding the deserters be handed over to them. Shaikh Said sent them a message saying:

“The people you are looking for are with me. If you arrest them while they are my guests, you will dishonour me. You can arrest them after I leave the place.” (Fazıl, 1992).

The commanders, however, insisted that they were there to arrest the deserters and must take them in. Shaikh Said's brother, Shaikh Abdurrahim, suggested to the commanders that since not all the people they wanted were guilty, they should let the innocent ones go. Though Lieutenant Hasan Husnu accepted this suggestion, unfortunately there was an exchange of gunfire between the police and the Shaikh's men. It was not clear who pulled the trigger first, but this incident triggered an uprising. Wherever the people heard the news, they expelled officials from the towns and villages. The tribes marched to Darahini. Shaikh Said together with his men entered Hakik village on

15 February. The following day, Darahini fell to the Shaikh's forces. Darahini was made the temporary capital. There he signed his first official letter as Amirul-Mujahidin Muhammad Said Naqshbandi and appointed Faqi Hasan of the Modan tribe, Governor of Darahini. Butyan, Mistan, Tavas and Silvan were among the tribes who joined Shaikh Said. After taking over Lice and Hani he decided to march on to Diyarbakir, making his headquarters at Tala, north of Diyarbakir (Yücedağ, 2010).

The Government at Ankara declared Martial Law in the eastern region on 23 February 1925 and rushed reinforcements (Mumcu, 1993). Ibrahim, Mustafa and Hasan, the chieftains of the Chan tribe, took Chabakchur on 17 February. Their advance with assistance from Khormek and Lolan tribes, drove off the local Turkish garrison. Shaikh Abdurrahim took Maden and Chermik on 29 February with the help of Ayub's troops. They also captured Ergani, which was an important town. Shaikh Said's offensive was almost over by the end of March.

Prime Minister Fethi Okyar (Bey) who was forced to resign was replaced by Ismet Inonu on 2 March. After a heated debate the new Government got the Imposition of Order (Takriri Sukun) Bill, through Parliament, acquiring exceptional powers (Mumcu, 1993).

There was criticism of the authorities' tactics from different quarters. Kazim Karabekir Pasha, Chairman of the Republican Progressive Party (RPP), was especially critical. He said: "The Revolutionary Courts were formed during the Independence War. At that time, they were necessary, but, now if Ismet Inonu thinks that setting up the Revolutionary Courts again is the answer to the current uprising, he is mistaken. He must know that one cannot rule the country with unfounded doubts and suspicions." (Aybars, 2012). Ali Fuad Pasha, Feridun Fikri Bey (Dusunsel), MP for Dersim, Halis Turgut Bey and Rauf Bey, both MPs for Sivas, also were critical of the Imposition of Order Bill and urged reform of the Revolutionary Courts (Aybars, 2012).

The Government deployed a large contingent of troops in Kurdistan who surrounded Diyarbakir and forced the Kurdish tribes to join Turkish forces. Shaikh Said's forces withdrew from Diyarbakir on 27 March.

The Government crushed the uprising, killing many people - mostly Kurds - and destroying many villages. Public figures were sentenced to death, even some who had no connection with the uprising.

Shaikh Said was a pious man who challenged secularisation and westernisation of Turkey. Not only was he a sheikh but his father, Mahmud, and grandfather, Shaikh Ali, were also men of spiritual and religious attainments. His grandfather who founded a religious lodge (tekke) - of which first his father and then he became the head in succession - was revered as a saint after his death.

When his executioner asked him for his last wish, the Shaikh asked for a pen and paper. "My hanging is not important as long as my struggle is for Allah's religion."

His last words, he wrote in Arabic and signed:

"Muhammad Said Palevi al-Amedi, "June 28 1925. Time: 2.30 pm."

Born in 1865, Shaikh Said was only 60 - still "a very healthy, strong and handsome man", sporting a full white beard dyed with henna.

The template of revolutions, the French Revolution

The French Revolution is considered as One of the most well-known contributions to social uprisings. It took place where the society was reigned

under terror, the uprising against the Reign of Terror became synonymous with revolutions that took place afterwards; the founder of the new Turkish state followed the footsteps of the French Revolution.

Guillotining played an essential role by the twelve men who were responsible for ruling France with an iron-grip, they chose to impose the will of Committee of Public Safety. Like the Convention which set up Revolutionary Tribunal, the twelve men of the Modern Turkish state also set up Revolutionary Tribunal and at its hands the reign of terror became a useful tool to extent means of governing with heavy hand it wasn't the guillotine but gallows to serve to eliminate opposition and possible opposition to the twelve men of Turkey.

To counter opposition, the new ruling elite of the Republic like French Revolution formed the Revolutionary Tribunal which severely dealt with opposing people. Whilst the very name Robespierre symbolised terror in France in the same vein, the three Ali's in Turkey who acted as judge and jury at the Turkish revolutionary courts provided similar reactions.

Though the French Revolution had had a bloody experience it still managed to end the reign of terror and honour ideals of revolution: Libert , Egalit , Fraternit . However one does not witness the same principles upheld by the new ruling elite of Turkish Republic. On the contrary Turkish people suffered and deprived their basic freedom of choice. Whenever the citizens of the republic attempted to take their fate in their own hands it inevitably ended with little achievement, either overtly or covertly by the military or their agencies.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this study highlighted the correlations between revolutions and how bloody one could get. As with the idea that the French revolution was seen as a template for various other revolutions to come, in particular to this article, the Turkish republic. One feature that is focused in particular is the opposition party to the revolution.

This article was an attempt to re-examine the early days of the Modern Turkish Republic which shows similarities in its way to implement the rule of law and govern the newly formed state. A significant turning point for the

republic was the abolishment of the Shari'ah law in 1923, despite various political figures being particularly outspoken and in support of the Shari'ah, like Ali Shukru Bey. We also see how the opposition is silenced parallel to previous revolutionary leaders such as King Henry VIII, such as the execution of Thomas Moore, likewise the French revolutionaries come to mind.

Another noteworthy matter examined was the conflict that arose with the changing of tradition and gradual removal of Islam. The study conducts and analysis the way members of parliament and significant muslim clerics tried to get their voice heard alas to no avail, as some were misunderstood and silenced. In conjunction, the literature that was produced by the citizens of the country showed passion and belief and love, while in comparison great poets such as Wilfred Owen showed disillusionment in patriotism.

References

- Aybars, E., (1995). İstiklal Mahkemeleri. İleri Kitabevi.
- Ceylan, H H, (1989). Cumhuriyet Döneminde Din-Devlet İlişkileri, 2.Baskı. ed. Risale, İstanbul. Damar, A, (1961). Hatıralarım. Tan Gazetesi ve Matbaası, İstanbul.
- Fazıl, N. (1992). Son Devrin Din Mazlumları. Büyük Doğu Yayınları. İstanbul. İz, M., (2013). Yılların İzi. 5. Baskı. Kitabevi. İstanbul.
- Lewis, B., (2009). Modern Türkiye'nin Doğuşu, 3.Baskı. ed. Ankara.
- Mardin, Ş., (1991). Türk Modernleşmesi, Makaleler 4. İletişim Yayınları, 1. Baskı, İstanbul.
- Mısıroğlu, K, (2012). Trabzon Mebusu Şehidi Muazzez Ali Şükrü Bey, 1. Baskı. Sebül Yayınevi. İstanbul.
- Mumcu, U., (1993). Kürt- İslam Ayaklanması. 7. Baskı, Tekin Yayınevi, Ankara. Saint-Exupery, A.D., (2012). Küçük Prens, 23rd ed. Mavibulut.
- Türkmen, H., (2012). Şeyh Said ve İslami Direniş Ruhu Kaynak: Şeyh Said ve İslami Direniş Ruhu. Haksöz Dergisi, Sayı 255.
- Yücedağ, Ş., (2010). Şeyh Sait İsyanı ve Ezeli Düşman İngiltere. IQ Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık. İstanbul.