

Araştırma Makalesi / Research Article

**A STUDY ON TURKISH DIPLOMATS OFFICIATED
IN THE EARLY REPUBLICAN PERIOD***

Yenal ÜNAL**

Abstract

It is a fact that the farsightedness of Atatürk has a serious role in the formation of a peaceful and rational policy of Republic of Turkey, implemented covering the period between 1923-1938. However, there are many valuable diplomats who have taken part in the solution of the issues through peaceful methods and the best presentation and representation of the country in the formation of young Turkey's foreign policy. These diplomats, who served in the period of Atatürk and whose number reached thirty-eight, had great efforts on the demolition of the diplomacy tradition of the Ottoman Empire in the last period which Turkey was exposed to hundreds of years and in eliminating the possible problems faced by the country. In other words, the vast majority of these diplomats have important place in resolving Turkey's problems experienced with various countries in favor of Turkey. From time to time, they foresaw some of the problems that the country will face and produced solutions for these problems. The Republic of Turkey has demonstrated the seriousness of the state since its foundation years with the anti-imperialist policies it pursued during its establishment and the victory of Lausanne diplomacy against the greatest states of the World. In later years, given the success achieved in Turkey's foreign policy, it turns out that the envoys who served in the Atatürk period were well trained and qualified diplomats. This examination has made various assessments on individuals who witnessed the founding years of the Republic of Turkey in particular and who served in the Turkish diplomacy of Atatürk period. In this context, many issues, especially the names, the education of diplomats who served in the foundation years of the republic, overseas and domestic duties they have done before, Turkey's foreign representations in that period and their distribution by continents were examined.

Keywords: Early Republican Period, Atatürk Period, Foreign Policy, Diplomacy, Diplomat.

* This study is an expanded version of the verbal report presented at the International Congress of Scientific Research held in Nevşehir on September 9-12, 2018.

** Assoc. Prof. Dr. Bartın University Department of History,
(yenalunal@yahoo.com), (Orcid: 0000-0002-4043-8424).

ERKEN CUMHURİYET DÖNEMİNDE GÖREV YAPAN TÜRK DİPLOMATLARI ÜZERİNE BİR İNCELEME

Öz

Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Devleti'nin, 1923-1938 yılları arasında uyguladığı barışçıl ve rasyonel politikaların oluşumunda Atatürk'ün ileri görüşlülüğünün ciddi bir role sahip olduğu bir gerçektir. Bununla birlikte genç Türkiye'nin takip ettiği dış politikanın oluşumunda, meselelerin barışçıl yöntemlerle çözümünde ve ülkenin en iyi şekilde tanıtılıp, temsil edilmesinde görev almış birçok diplomat vardır. Atatürk devrinde görev yapan ve sayıları otuz sekize varan bu diplomatların, Türkiye'nin yüzlerce yıldır maruz kaldığı Osmanlı Devleti'nin son dönemlerindeki diplomasi geleneğinin yıkılmasında, ülkenin karşılaştığı muhtemel sıkıntıların giderilmesinde büyük gayretleri olmuştur. Diğer bir ifadeyle bu diplomatların büyük çoğunluğu Türkiye'nin çeşitli ülkelerle yaşadığı sorunların Türkiye'nin lehine olacak şekilde çözülmesinde önemli vazifeler görmüşlerdir. Kimi zaman da ülkenin karşılaşacağı bazı sıkıntıları önceden görerek bu sorunlara yönelik çözüm üretmişlerdir. Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Devleti, kuruluş evresinde takip ettiği anti-emperyalist politikalarla, dünyanın en büyük devletlerine karşı kazandığı Lozan diplomasi zaferiyle, ciddi bir devlet olduğunu daha kuruluş yıllarında ispat etmiştir. Sonraki yıllarda Türkiye'nin dış politikada elde ettiği başarılar göz önüne alındığında Atatürk döneminde görev alan elçilerin gayet iyi yetişmiş ve nitelikli diplomatlar olduğu ortaya çıkmaktadır. Bu incelemede Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin özellikle kuruluş yıllarına şahitlik etmiş, Atatürk devri diplomasisi ve bu dönemde diplomaside görev almış şahıslar üzerine çeşitli değerlendirmeler yapılmıştır. Bu kapsamda cumhuriyetin kuruluş yıllarında görev almış diplomatların adları, tahsilleri, daha önce yaptıkları yurt dışı ve yurt içi görevleri, Türkiye'nin o dönemdeki dış temsilcilikleri ve kıtalara göre dağılımları konusu başta olmak üzere birçok husus incelenmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi, Atatürk Dönemi, Dış Politika, Diplomasi, Diplomat.

Introduction

According to the Turkish dictionary, diplomacy (*Diplomatie in French*,¹ *Diplomacy in English*²) is defined as the whole of treaties regulating international relations, the art of representing his/her country in a foreign country and at international meetings, the profession of the person working in the diplomatic business, and resourcefulness in international negotiations.³ The word diplomacy comes from the Greek word "*diploma*", which means "*paper document with a signature which is folded in half*". Its Latin counterpart is recommendation or license of authorization. In practice, it means the passport issued by the emperor

1 Pars Tuğlacı, *Büyük Türkçe-Fransızca Sözlük*, 4th Edition, İnkılap Publishing, İstanbul, 1991, p. 219.

2 *Türkçe/Osmanlıca-İngilizce Sözlüğü*, 2nd Edition, Sev Publishing, İstanbul, 2013, p. 301.

3 *Türkçe Sözlük*, Prepared by İsmail Parlatur et al. 9th Edition, Volume: 1, Turkish Language Institution Publications, Ankara, 1998, p. 597.

or the senate to be used in the postal vehicles of the country, as well as the concession that grants some rights to those who do military service.⁴

In relation to the concept of diplomacy used to describe international relations, documents regulating the relations of one state with other states are called "*diplomas*". In this context, the word "*diploma*" is used as a letter of trust in today's literature. Therefore, people who perform interstate relations with this diploma given to them are also called "*diplomats*". In this case, it is possible to define diplomacy as "*the duty of the diplomat to whom the diploma is given by the state to perform in his/her foreign affairs*". Based on this, it is possible to define the concept of diplomacy as a whole of relations that are based on peace in one state's relations with other states, which change in the process according to its military and political position. In other words, it can also be said that it is the process of interaction of foreign policies that reflect different interests at different times. At this point, there is a fact that should not be kept out of sight, which is the fact that the concept of foreign policy and the concept of diplomacy have different meanings. So much so that foreign policy specifies the expectations of a country from the international system and its goals in this direction, while diplomacy refers to the whole of the procedures, methods and devices used to achieve these goals. The concept of diplomacy, whose history dates back to quite ancient times in history, has developed over the centuries. In this process, diplomacy was mostly used to end wars and solve problems. Another important thing to know about the concept of diplomacy is that each state has its own understanding of diplomacy. However, this understanding of each state has constantly evolved in the historical development process.⁵

Looking at Turkish history, it is seen that diplomacy has been used since the most ancient periods. The Ottoman Empire, one of the largest Turkish States in history, seems to have benefited greatly from diplomacy during the establishment, Ascension and especially the fall periods. After the destruction of this state, it left a legacy to the state of the Republic of Turkey in the field of diplomacy as in all areas. For example, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, translation offices and almost all of their employees from Western-style diplomatic institutions have entered the service of the new Turkish State. It is a fact that an intellectual class, which started to grow especially from the Tanzimat period and had a Western-style education, dominated the internal and external Ottoman bureaucracy. A large part of the individuals belonging to this intellectual class, who were very well educated at work, subsequently passed into the service of the state of the Republic of Turkey. As a matter of fact, the basis of early Republican diplomacy was formed by this enlightened diplomat

4 Mühahat S. Kütükoğlu, *Osmanlı Belgelerinin Dili*, 4th Edition, Turkish Historical Society Publications, Ankara, 2018, p. 3.

5 <https://www.beyaztarih.com/osmanli-tarihi/osmanli-diplomasisinde-yasanan-degisimler> (Accessed on 20.03.2020)

class inherited from the Ottoman Empire and the core staff that started to grow in Lausanne.⁶

The state of the Republic of Turkey, established after the Ottoman Empire in Turkish history, is a political structure formed around the conditions set out by World War I and the National Struggle Movement, which is a continuation of this war.⁷ The Ottoman Empire, which came out of World War I by paying very heavily for its entry into this war,⁸ almost took on the appearance of a city-state with the implementation of the provisions of the Armistice of Moudros of October 30, 1918.⁹ On the other hand, the Anatolian movement led by Mustafa Kemal Pasha, who did not accept the occupation of all parts of the country within the framework of the post-war conditions and the provisions of the Moudros Armistice, successfully won the War of Independence against the Entente States as a result of long struggles. Mudanya Armistice was signed first on October 3-11, 1922 and then the Lausanne Peace Treaty was signed on July 24, 1923.¹⁰

In the period from 1918 to 1922, Turkish people gave an example of a very tough struggle and succeeded against their enemies. However, the Ottoman Empire, the legacy of centuries, reached the end of the collapse stage and was completely removed from the historical scene with the abolition of the Sultanate on November 1, 1922. On the legacy of this destroyed state, a modern state was formed and the state of the modern Republic of Turkey was built. The Lausanne peace treaty, the most concrete indicator of the success of the Turkish War of Independence, was signed at the end of a nearly seven-month negotiation process.¹¹

During the Lausanne negotiations, not only the situation that emerged as a result of the First World War and the National Struggle was discussed, but many serious issues belonging to the Ottoman Empire from previous centuries

6 Timuçin Kodaman, Ekrem Yaşar Akçay, "Kuruluştan Yıkılışa Kadar Osmanlı Diplomasisi Tarihi ve Türkiye'ye Bıraktığı Miras", *Süleyman Demirel University Journal of Social Sciences*, Issue: 22, 2010, p. 86.

7 Resul Yavuz, The View and the Attitude of Allies High Commissioners Toward İstanbul During the Declaration of National Pact", *Tarih ve Günce Journal*, Issue: 1, İzmir 2017, p. 282-285.

8 Temel İskit, *Diplomasinin Gücü Modern Ortadoğu'nun Şekillenmesi*, İstanbul Bilgi University Publications, İstanbul, 2017, p. 7.

9 Mehmet Gönlübol, Cem Sar, *Atatürk ve Türkiye'nin Dış Politikası*, Atatürk Research Center Publications, Ankara, 1997, p. 1.

10 Temuçin Faik Ertan et al. *Başlangıcından Günümüze Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Tarihi*, 4th Edition, Siyasal Bookstore, Ankara, 2016, p. 138; Yenal Ünal, "Milli Mücadele: Mondros Mütarekesi'nden Sevr Antlaşması'na Türkiye'de Yaşanan Siyasi Gelişmeler", *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Tarihi*, Edited by Nurgün Koç, Volume: 1, Ideal Culture Publications, İstanbul, 2019, p. 92-98.

11 Resul Yavuz, "Milli Mücadele Dönemi ve Cumhuriyet Yönetimine Geçişte Türk Hariciye Teşkilatı'nın Gelişimi" *Gazi Akademik Bakış Journal*, Volume: 13, Issue: 26, 2020, p. 218; For detailed information about the Lausanne peace treaty, which still loses nothing of its importance today and many of its assessments are far from scientific knowledge, see İsmail Soysal, *Türkiye'nin Siyasal Antlaşmaları (1920-1945)*, 2nd Edition Volume 1, Turkish Historical Society Publications, Ankara, 1989, p. 67-244.

were brought to the table. As a matter of course, the Lausanne Peace Treaty could not solve all these problems. For example, the Mosul Question was left after Lausanne. Again Republican-era Turkey had to face many issues that were needed to be resolved such as Population Exchange, Hatay Question, the Straits Commission, the Turkey-Syria border. All these issues had to be resolved through peace and especially by mobilizing all the possibilities of diplomacy to the fullest in order not to put the Turkish nation, who had spent time on the battlefields for decades, face the danger of war again. Atatürk established Turkish foreign policy on two basic principles. These are not to compromise Turkey's political independence and to resolve interstate disputes by peaceful means. Other principles developed based on these two main elements are as follows: The solution of the issues that cannot be settled in Lausanne in accordance with the basic principles of the Turkish revolution and the understanding of national politics, the implementation of the principles set forth in the Lausanne Treaty, the normalization of relations with the great states and the establishment of friendship relations with neighboring countries.¹²

During this period, on the one hand, a new state was tried to be established in the devastated country within the framework of modern norms, and on the other hand, it was aimed to work diplomacy with as rational an understanding as possible by avoiding war and ending the problems that were waiting to be solved in favor of Turkey. As a matter of fact, almost all of the problems encountered between 1923 and 1938 after Lausanne were tried to be solved by diplomatic means without choosing a military option. In this way, most of the problems other than the Mosul issue have been solved in favor of Turkey as a result of effective diplomatic activities.¹³

In this process, there are many diplomats who have defended Turkey's interests both through their activities at the stage of resolving these issues by diplomatic means, as well as through their duties as ambassadors and consul in various countries. These diplomats are of particular importance because they contributed to the abandonment of the tradition of diplomacy in the last periods of the Ottoman state and instead to the creation of a diplomatic tradition that could defend Turkey's national interests within the framework of the principle of sovereign equality of states. Therefore, it is now a very serious need to identify the figures who served in foreign affairs during the founding years of Turkey and to make a further assessment of its diplomatic activities; because even today, diplomacy is one of the most effective weapons in international relations. The history of diplomacy, on the other hand, is a treasure trove of information that should be evaluated by today's historians. Therefore, the diplomacy of the Atatürk era, where the most successful diplomatic victories in the history of the Republic were won, is of serious value today.

12 Refik Turan et al., *Atatürk İlkeleri ve İnkılap Tarihi*, 18th Edition, Ankara, 2011, p. 228-229.

13 Ertan et al., *ibid*, p. 151-152.

Within the scope of this research conducted on diplomats who worked in the first years of the Republic, some of the questions asked above were tried to be answered as an “*introduction*”. In the newly established state of the Republic of Turkey, it was attempted to identify the people who took important duties by entering the service of the Foreign Ministry and to determine who served with which duty and where.¹⁴

Extremely important information is available in many research sources about diplomats who served in the early years of the Republic. However, it is possible to say that the number of copyright works revealed in this field is low. One of the researchers most interested in the subject is Bilal N. Şimşir, also a former ambassador. Şimşir’s work named “*Our Diplomats*” has a distinct importance since it is the starting point of the study and it has the characteristic of being the main source considering the information he has given.

Turkish Diplomacy and Diplomats in the First Years of the Republic

In this study, thirty-eight Turkish diplomats, the vast majority of whom served during the reign of Atatürk or began to experience their first professional experience during this period, were included. Among these personalities; Bekir Sami Kunduh, Ahmet Muhtar Mollaoğlu, Yusuf Kemal Tengirşek, İsmet İnönü, Dr. Tevfik Rüştü Aras, Hasan Saka, İhsan Sabri Çağlayangil and Feridun Cemal Erkin, were those who served as the Minister of Foreign Affairs in the past. The remaining thirty people served as embassies or ambassadors.¹⁵

During the reign of Atatürk, the number of independent states in the world was approximately forty. The number of Turkish embassies has reached up to twenty-six. These embassies were gathered in the following capitals: Athens, Baghdad, Belgrade, Bern, Berlin, Brussels, Budapest, Bucharest, Kabul, Cairo, The Hague, London, Madrid, Moscow, Paris, Prague, Rio de Janeiro, Sofia, Stockholm, Tehran, Tallinn, Tirana, Tokyo, Warsaw, Washington and Vienna.¹⁶ The distribution of the twenty-six embassies according to the continents was as follows: 1 embassy in Africa (Cairo), 2 embassies in America (Rio de Janeiro and Washington), 4 embassies in Asia (Baghdad, Kabul, Tehran and Tokyo). The

14 For more information about Ahmet Ferit Tek, see Yenal Ünal, *Ahmet Ferit Tek*, Bilgeoğuz Publications, İstanbul, 2009, 187 p.

15 Bilal N. Şimşir, *Bizim Diplomatlar*, Bilgi Publishing, Ankara, 1996, p. 18.

16 Apart from these capitals, agencies were opened in the capital of Azerbaijan, Baku and Georgia’s capital Tbilisi between 1920-1923. However, as these two countries lost their independence in a short time, the said agencies were closed before they were raised to the level of embassies. Again, during this period, Turkey’s permanent charge d’affaires was opened in three centers. These were Addis-Ababa, the capital of Ethiopia (Abyssinia), Nanking, the previous capital of the Republic of China, and Santiago de Chile, the capital of Chile. Given the number of agencies and d’affaires, the number of centers in which Turkey had a permanent diplomatic representative at that time increases to thirty-one. Consulates are excluded from this number. See Şimşir, *ibid*, p. 19-20.

remaining nineteen embassies were gathered in Europe (Athens, Belgrade, Bern, Berlin, Brussels, Budapest, Bucharest, The Hague, London, Madrid, Moscow, Paris, Prague, Sofia, Stockholm, Tallinn, Tirana, Warsaw, and Vienna).

The names of the ambassadors who served in these twenty-six centers between 1920-1938 can be listed as follows:¹⁷ Mehmet Enis Akaygen,¹⁸ Ali Haydar Aktay, Hamdi Arpağ, Hüseyin Ragıp Baydur, Yusuf Hikmet Bayur, Dr. Tevfik Bıyıklıoğlu, Ali Fuat Cebesoy, Hüseyin Vasıf Çınar, Suat Davaz, Mehmet Münir Ertegin, Memduh Şevket Esendal, Cevat Ezine, Hüseyin Gerece, Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu, Ahmet Muhtar Mollaoğlu, Kemalettin Sami, Hamdullah Suphi Tanrıöver, Ahmet Ferit Tek, Tahir Lütfi Tokay, Mehmet Emin Ali Türkgeldi, Ruşen Eşref Ünaydın, Ahmet Cevat Üstün, Muhittin Akyüz, Mehmet Ali Şevki İlhan, Zekai Apaydın,¹⁹ Nebil Batı, Ali Şevki Berker, Yahya Kemal Beyatlı, Behiç Erkin, Tevfik Kamil Koperler, Ragıp Raif Köseraif, Hasan Vasfi Menteş, Ali Fethi Okyar, İbrahim Tali Öngören, Cemal Hüsnü Taray, Mehmet Sabri Toprak, Hulusi Fuat Tugay and Fahrettin Türkkan.²⁰

During the years of the War of Independence, diplomats appointed abroad with the title of representative or ambassador also reserved the rights of Deputies. In other words, they did not resign as a deputy when they went abroad as a permanent official, they did not lose their status as a deputy, and they were only considered to be on leave from the Turkish Grand National Assembly. They were assigned “... to remain as deputies” If they returned to Ankara before the new general election, they could take their place in Parliament again as deputies.²¹

Eleven of the thirty-eight ambassadors who represented Turkey abroad

17 Historian Bilal N. Şimşir, also a former envoy, gave the Registry File Numbers of the former ambassadors, who had extremely critical duties in the first years of the Republic, in the Archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs as follows: Akaygen 50, Aktay 58, 89, Arpağ 232, Baydur 129, Bayur 117, Çınar 420, Davaz 29, Cevat Ezine 3/94, Ertegin 63, Esendal 114, Gerece 344, Karaosmanoğlu 437, Kemalettin Sami 186, Ahmet Muhtar 315, Tek 229, Tokay 165, Türkgeldi 87, Ünaydın 426, Üstün 98. For detailed information, see Şimşir, *ibid*, p. 19.

18 A book on the life and professional activities of Enis Akaygen was published by his grandson Enis Tulça. For detailed information about Akaygen's life and diplomatic activities, see Enis Tulça, *Atatürk, Venizolas ve Bir Diplomat Enis Bey*, Simurg Publications, İstanbul, 2003.

19 For detailed information about Apaydın's life and diplomatic activities, see Ekrem Apaydın, “Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin Bakan ve Büyükelçilerinden Zekai Apaydın'ın Albümünden”, *The Journal of Atatürk Research Center*, Volume: 1, Issue: 1, Atatürk Research Center, Ankara, Ankara, 1984, p. 300-308.

20 Şimşir, *ibid*, p. 18, 19, 20; Cami Baykurt Bey and Celalettin Arif Bey worked as delegates in Rome between 1920-1923. Kazım Dirik, on the other hand, worked as a delegate in Tbilisi. Twenty-two of these ambassadors were those who served as deputies. The envoys who served as members of parliament in the first term and in the following terms can be listed as follows: Ali Fuat Cebesoy, Muhittin Akyüz, Tevfik Kamil Koperler, Zekai Apaydın, Hamdi Arpağ, Ali Fethi Okyar, Yusuf Hikmet Bayur, Ali Şevki Berker, Yahya Kemal Beyatlı, Hüseyin Vasıf Çınar, Memduh Şevket Esendal, Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu, Behiç Erkin, Kemalettin Sami, Vasfi Menteş, Ahmet Muhtar Mollaoğlu, İbrahim Tali Öngören, Cemal Hüsnü Taray, Hamdullah Suphi Tanrıöver, Ahmet Ferit Tek, Ruşen Eşraf Ünaydın ve Sabri Toprak. See Şimşir, *ibid*, p. 20.

21 This application was later removed.

during the time of Atatürk were those who also took part in the government and served as ministers. Some of these people served as ministers several times. When the agreement²² was requested, it was particularly stated that the person to be appointed as the ambassador was one of the former ministers. For example, while Ahmet Ferit Tek, who was appointed as the London Embassy, was requested from England for an agreement, it was stated that he was a former Deputy of Finance and Internal Affairs. Some ambassadors could be appointed as ministers upon their return to Ankara after serving abroad. Hüseyin Vasıf Çınar was a statesman who left the ministry and became an ambassador, then left the embassy and took the ministerial seat again. Ali Fethi Okyar was a former prime minister. The names who had ministry and embassy duties on different dates in the Atatürk period can be listed as follows: Ahmet Muhtar Mollaoğlu, Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Zekai Apaydın, Ministry of Agriculture, Public Works and National Defense; Yusuf Hikmet Bayur, Ministry of Education; Ali Fuat Cebesoy, Ministry of Public Works and Transport; Hüseyin Vasıf Çınar, Ministry of Education; Behiç Erkin, Ministry of Public Works; Fethi Okyar, Prime Ministry, Ministry of Interior, Justice and National Defense; Cemal Hüsnü Taray, Ministry of Education; Hamdullah Suphi Tanrıöver, Ministry of Education; Ahmet Ferit Tek, Ministry of Finance and Internal Affairs; Mehmet Sabri Toprak, Ministry of Agriculture.²³

Most of the first ambassadors of the republic were those who had higher education and graduated from war, civil, law and foreign schools. Some of them had a double degree. There were nine graduates of the Military Academy. There were seven graduates of the Civil School. There were seven graduates of law faculties. There were seven people who studied abroad. There was a graduate of the Faculty of Letters, two graduates of the Medical School, two people from the Galatasaray Sultanisi (High School) and a person with special education. Apart from these, the educational status of the two people was not fully determined in the examinations carried out within the scope of the research.²⁴

The people who served as diplomats in the early years of the Republic and the schools where they graduated included the following: Graduates of Military Academy with its former name "*Erkân-ı Harbiye*": Muhittin Akyüz, Tefik Bıyıklıoğlu, Ali Fuat Cebesoy, Kemalettin Sami, Behiç Erkin, Hüsrev Gerede, Fethi Okyar, Ahmet Ferit Tek and Fahrettin Türkkan.²⁵ Ambassadors

22 An official document requested by the administration of that country prior to the appointment of a person as an ambassador to a foreign country, stating that this person is considered appropriate as an ambassador. In other words, it is a request for an application by any country to the opposite party regarding a new diplomatic officer. See Ahmet Emin Dağ, *Uluslararası İlişkiler ve Diplomasi Sözlüğü*, 4th Edition Vadi Publications, İstanbul, 2016, p. 21.

23 Şimşir, *ibid*, p. 20-21.

24 Şimşir, *ibid*, p. 21-22.

25 Four of these soldiers were elevated to the rank of Pasha. Muhittin Akyüz, Ali Fuat Cebesoy, Kemalettin Sami, Fahrettin Türkkan Pasha were the soldiers. Ali Fuat Cebesoy, Kemalettin Sami, Fahrettin Türkkan and Tefik Bıyıklıoğlu, among these nine military-origin

who graduated from the Civil School: Zekai Apaydın, Nebil Batı, Tevfik Kamil Koperler, Ahmet Muhtar Mollaoğlu, Vasfı Menteş, Tahir Lütü Tokay and Cevat Üstün. Graduates of Law School: Ali Haydar Aktay, Hamdi Arpağ, Hüseyin Ragıp Baydur, Ali Şevki Berker, Hüseyin Vasfı Çınar, Suat Davaz and Mehmet Münir Erteğün. Those who were educated abroad: Ali Şevki Alhan, Yusuf Hikmet Bayur, Yahya Kemal Beyatlı, Ragıp Raif Köseraif, Cemal Hüsnü Taray, Mehmet Sabri Toprak and Mehmet Emin Ali Türkgeldi. Those who graduated from the Medical School: İbrahim Tali Öngören and Hulusi Fuat Töğay. Ruşen Eşren Ünaydın graduated from the Faculty of Letters. The graduates of Galatasaray High School²⁶ were Enis Akaygen and Hamdullah Suphi Tanrıöver. During this period, the ambassadors holding a Double Diploma consisted of the following names: Hamdi Arpağ, Tevfik Kamil Koperler, Ragıp Raif Köseraif, Ahmet Ferit Tek, Mehmet Emin Ali Türkgeldi and Ahmet Cevat Üstün.²⁷

Some of the first envoys of the Republican period were inherited from the Ottoman Empire. They also worked for many years in the staff of the Ottoman foreign ministry, gaining experience in the central and foreign organization. Ahmet Muhtar Bey, who served as the Attorney of Foreign Affairs in the Ankara Government and later the Embassy in Moscow and Washington, served as an ambassador in Sofia during the Ottoman period. Likewise, Cevat Ezine Bey was an embassy in Belgrade during the Ottoman period. The number of ambassadors transferred from the Foreign Ministry of the Ottoman state to the Foreign Office of the Republic of Turkey was twelve and it is possible to sort their names as follows: Enis Akaygen, Ali Haydar Aktay, Mehmet Ali Şevki İlhan, Nebil Batı, Ali Şevki Berber, Suat Davaz, Cevat Ezine, Tevfik Kamil Koperler, Ragıp Raif Köseraif, Ahmet Muhtar Mollaoğlu, Fethi Okyar and Ahmet Ferit Tek.

Twenty-six of the thirty-eight ambassadors identified within the scope of our research were not professional diplomats. Later, they came from other professions and worked as diplomats within the framework of the country's requirements. These people, who trained themselves well in other professions, soon learned the subtleties of the diplomatic profession and have also succeeded in this field. According to Bilal Şimşir, some of these twenty-six diplomats who later entered diplomacy attended the Lausanne Peace Conference and learned here what diplomatic strife means. These people, who participated in the seven-month-long Lausanne talks, gained extremely important experience and took advantage of this experience when they were appointed as ambassadors in the future. In other words, Lausanne served as a kind of internship for the envoys in this group. The following are the names who gained experience at the Lausanne Conference and later served as embassies: Mehmet Münir Erteğün,

ambassadors, served as embassies once. The other five military-origin ambassadors Muhittin Akyüz, Behiç Erkin, Hüsrev Gerede, Fethi Okyar and Ahmet Ferit Tek continued their service in diplomacy for many years. For detailed information, see Şimşir, *ibid*, p. 21-22.

26 Galatasaray Sultanisi.

27 Şimşir, *ibid*, p. 22-24.

Yusuf Hikmet Bayur, Tefik Bıyıklıođlu, Ruřen Eřref Ünaydın, Yahya Kemal Beyatlı, Mehmet Emin Ali Türkgeldi, Cevat Üstün, Zekai Apaydın, Tefik Kamil Koperler, Ahmet Ferit Tek and Hüseyin Rađıp Baydur. However, Lausanne also had an Ankara perspective. There were also people who would serve as embassies in the following years among the officials who corresponded with the delegates in Lausanne on the Ankara line, who exchanged information between these two lines, and who prepared information within the framework of the instructions given. For example, Undersecretary Suat Davaz Bey, who was among these people, benefited from the experience he gained during Lausanne during his embassy.²⁸

In addition, there were envoys that Atatürk found and raised directly and brought to Turkish diplomacy. Among these people, the names such as İbrahim Tali Öngören, Hüsrev Gerece, Ruřen Eřref Ünaydın, Yusuf Hikmet Bayur, Hüseyin Vasıf Çınar ve Cemal Hüsnü Taray came to the fore. Atatürk identified those who have the ability to do this job especially among young people, gave them various tasks, brought successful ones to diplomacy.²⁹

Ambassadors who served in the period of Atatürk between 1923 and 1938 were those who spent their youth years in an extraordinary period. They witnessed collapsing of an Empire and the process of establishing a state that was re-formed on the ashes of that empire. The declaration of the Second Constitutional Monarchy, the Tripoli War, the Balkan Wars, the First World War, the War of Independence and the Lausanne Conference were the major political and military developments they actually experienced. Almost all of them contributed to the formation of the new Turkish State founded on the ruins of the empire in one way or another. Although they were born and grew up in the painful years that the Ottoman Empire collapsed, they faced great difficulties and raised themselves very well. Most of the ambassadors who served as diplomats in the period 1923-1938 were people who had the opportunity to reach both Atatürk and İsmet İnönü directly. They received the utmost support from these great state leaders while successfully representing Turkey abroad. The first ambassadors of the Republic put forward extremely important efforts to protect the law of the state of the Modern Turkish Republic in the international arena, protect it and increase its reputation in the world.³⁰

28 Şimşir, *ibid*, p. 24-25.

29 Şimşir, *ibid*, p. 26.

30 Şimşir, *ibid*, p. 26.

Conclusion

The state of the Republic of Turkey is a state formed after the success of the National Struggle Movement, which was given under very difficult conditions. Following the defeat of the World War I and the signing of the Armistice of Moudros dated October 30, 1918, the Ottoman Empire withdrew from the stage of history. But the Turkish nation, led by Mustafa Kemal Pasha, made an extraordinary effort to stop the provisions of the Armistice of Moudros and completely nullify the Treaty of Sevres, which was an edict of execution on behalf of Turkey, and succeeded. The most important official document confirming this success is the Lausanne peace treaty, signed on July 24, 1923.

It is obvious that some historians who try to evaluate Lausanne as a failed document within the framework of today's conditions ignore the political, military and economic conditions that Turkey fell into between 1918 and 1922; because even reversing these conditions completely against Turkey is a miracle for that period. Moreover, Lausanne peace negotiations were not only an arena where the conditions emerging as a result of the World War I or the War of Independence were discussed, but also an area where problems dating back hundreds of years were discussed. As a matter of fact, after the signing of the Lausanne peace treaty, many years of efforts were made to resolve some issues.

In order to resolve these issues, the young Turkey was intended to pursue a foreign policy within the framework of the principle of "*peace at home, peace in the world*" and in a procedure that will protect the interests of the country to the end in the period after the signing of the Lausanne Peace Treaty on July 24, 1923 and the proclamation of the Republic on October 29, 1923. As a matter of fact, the state of the Republic of Turkey tried to express itself during the period 1923-1938, avoiding the war as much as possible, but protecting Turkey's interests in almost every issue to the end. Due to this philosophy, many important issues in foreign policy other than the Mosul issue were resolved in favor of Turkey.

It is a well-known fact that the farsightedness of Atatürk played a serious role in the formation of the peaceful and rational policies implemented by the state of the Republic of Turkey between 1923 and 1938. However, there were also many valuable diplomats who were involved in the formation of the foreign policy that young Turkey followed, the peaceful resolution of issues and the best promotion and representation of the country. These diplomats, who served in the era of Atatürk and numbered up to thirty-eight, made great efforts to break the tradition of diplomacy in the last periods of the Ottoman State, which Turkey has been subjected to for hundreds of years, and to eliminate the possible problems facing the country. In other words, the vast majority of these diplomats ensured that Turkey's problems with various countries were resolved in a way that was in favor of Turkey. Sometimes, they had come up with a

solution, anticipating some of the problems that the country would face. For this reason, just as in some shallow assessments made on the Lausanne peace treaty, it is in no way true that people who served as ambassadors in the early years of Republic-era Turkey are referred to as “*men becoming delegates just because of their ties*”. Such expressions are far from scientific and are common words. It is clear that some historians who caused information pollution by revealing such untruthful rumors did not conduct serious and scientific research on foreign officials and diplomats of this period who served in the era of Atatürk. Neither in Turkey nor in any country in the world, individuals have not been taken to foreign affairs and made ambassadors because they know how to wear a tie. However, the state of the Republic of Turkey proved that it has been a serious state since its founding years with the anti-imperialist policies it followed at the stage of establishment, with the victory of Lausanne diplomacy against the largest states of the world. Given the achievements of Turkey in foreign policy in the following years, it turns out that the ambassadors who served during the reign of Atatürk were well-trained and qualified people. If it is necessary to clarify this issue more, it would be appropriate to give the following example: Among the thirty-eight ambassadors who were found to have served officially during the Atatürk era, the diplomats who had the least education were Mehmet Enis Akaygen, Hamdullah Suphi Tanrıöver, Memduh Şevket Esendal and Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu. The fact that these four diplomats, whose education levels were lower compared to other thirty-four diplomats, were found to be the presence of huge names such as Hamdullah Suphi Tanrıöver, Memduh Şevket Esendal and Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu, is an extremely important data in order to determine the cultural level of diplomacy officials at that time; Because these names have proven themselves in every sense, have added value to Turkey with their services and have been able to live today with their works. For this reason, it is not a scientific approach to label officials who served in diplomacy in the early years of the Republic with expressions that have no basis, such as “*men becoming delegates just because of their ties*”. As a result of the investigations we conducted within the scope of this research, it was determined that thirty-eight people, who were among the first ambassadors of the republic, most of whom served during the time of Atatürk, and who came from various professions, served as delegates. Some small increases in this number can be achieved with new scientific research. Many of these thirty-eight diplomats were extremely well-educated, very well-trained and qualified people of the Ottoman era. These individuals, who saw, understood and realized the sacrifice made by the soldier on the battlefield during the years of national struggle, carried the same spirit into the field of diplomacy and undertook extremely important missions in the right representation of Turkey in the international arena.

The achievements gained in the field of foreign policy, the foundations of which were tried to be laid firmly during the reign of Atatürk, contributed to

the emergence of a serious tradition in this field. For example, Hasan Saka, who attended the Lausanne Peace Conference as a delegate, served as the Ministry of Foreign Affairs between 1944 and 1947 after Atatürk's death. These figures are those who were brought up in the diplomacy of the period of Atatürk, who broke the tradition of diplomacy in the last periods of the Ottoman state and successfully represented Turkey on the basis of the principle of sovereign equality of states. It should be clearly stated here that the tradition of diplomacy created between 1923 and 1938 successfully represented the state of the modern Republic of Turkey and served as a school for the training of new diplomats who would serve in the following years.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Encyclopedias-Dictionaries

- DAĞ, Ahmet Emin, *Uluslararası İlişkiler ve Diplomasi Sözlüğü*, 4th Edition Vadi Publications, İstanbul 2016.
- ESİN, Emel, "Ahmet Ferit Tek" *Turkish Encyclopedia*, Volume 31, 1982.
- TUĞLACI, Pars, *Turkish-French Dictionary*, 4th Edition İnkılap Bookstore, İstanbul 1991.
- Turkish Dictionary*, Prepared by İsmail Parlatır et al., 9 th Edition Volume 1, Publications of The Turkish Language Institution, Ankara 1998.

II. Books

- ERTAN, Temuçin Faik et al., *Başlangıcından Günümüze Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Tarihi*, 4th Edition, Siyasal Bookstore, Ankara 2016.
- GÖNLÜBOL, Mehmet; Cem Sar, *Atatürk ve Türkiye'nin Dış Politikası*, Atatürk Research Center Publications, Ankara 1997.
- GIRGIN, Kemal, *Diplomatik Anularla Dış İlişkilerimiz (Son 50 yıl: 1957-2006)*, 2nd Edition, İlgı Kültür Sanat Publishing, İstanbul 2007.
- İSKIT, Temel, *Diplomasinin Gücü Modern Ortadoğu'nun Şekillenmesi*, İstanbul Bilgi University Publications, İstanbul 2017.
- KÜTÜKOĞLU, Mübahat S. *Osmanlı Belgelerinin Dili*, 4th Edition, Turkish Historical Society Publications, Ankara 2018.
- SOSYAL, İsmail, *Türkiye'nin Siyasal Antlaşmaları (1920-1945)*, 2nd Edition, Volume 1, Ankara, Turkish Historical Society Publications, Ankara 1989.
- SÜSLÜ, Azmi; Mustafa BALCIOĞLU, *Atatürk'ün Silah Arkadaşları*, Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Şeref Üyeleri, Atatürk Research Center Publications, Ankara 1999.
- ŞİMŞİR, Bilal N. *Bizim Diplomatlar*, Bilgi Publishing, Ankara 1996.
- _____, *Şehit Diplomatlarımız (1973-1994)*, Bilgi Publishing, Ankara 2000.

- TULÇA, Enis, *Atatürk, Venizolas ve Bir Diplomat Enis Bey*, Simurg Publications, İstanbul 2003.
- TUNAYA, Tarık Zafer, *Türkiye’de Siyasal Partiler İkinci Meşrutiyet Dönemi 1908-1918*, 2nd Edition, Hürriyet Publications, Volume1, İstanbul 1988.
- TURAN, Refik et al., *Atatürk İlkeleri ve İnkılap Tarihi*, 18th Edition Ankara 2011.
- Türk, *Türk İstiklal Harbi’ne Katılan Tümen ve Daha Üst Kademelerdeki Komutanların Biyografileri*, 2nd Edition, General Staff, Ankara 1989.
- ÜNAL, Yenal, *Ahmet Ferit Tek*, Bilgeoğuz Publications, İstanbul 2009.

III. Articles

- APAYDIN, Ekrem, “Türkiye Cumhuriyeti’nin Bakan ve Büyükelçilerinden Zekai Apaydın’ın Albümünden”, *The Journal of Atatürk Research Center*, Volume: 1, Issue: 1, Atatürk Research Center, Ankara 1984, p. 300-308.
- KODAMAN, Timuçin; Ekrem Yaşar Akçay, “Kuruluşta Yıkılışa Kadar Osmanlı Diplomasisi Tarihi ve Türkiye’ye Bıraktığı Miras”, *Suleyman Demirel University of Social Sciences Journal*, Issue: 22, 2010, p. 75-92.
- ÜNAL, Yenal, “Milli Mücadele: Mondros Mütarekesi’nden Sevr Antlaşması’na Türkiye’de Yaşanan Siyasi Gelişmeler”, *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Tarihi*, Edited by Nurgün Koç, Volume: 1, Ideal Culture Publications, İstanbul, 2019, p. 92-150.
- YAVUZ, Resul, “The View and the Attitude of Allies High Commissioners Toward İstanbul During the Declaration of Natinoal Pact”, *Tarih ve Günce Journal*, Volume: 1, İzmir, 2017, p. 281-304.
- _____, “Milli Mücadele Dönemi ve Cumhuriyet Yönetimine Geçişte Türk Hariciye Teşkilatı’nın Gelişimi” *Gazi Akademik Bakış Journal*, Volume: 13, Issue: 26, 2020, p. 215-243.

IV. Web Sites

- <https://www.beyaztarih.com/osmanli-tarihi/osmanli-diplomasisinde-yasanan-degisimler> (Accessed on 27.09.2020.)